

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

October — December 1958

LONDON
S · P · C · K

1958

*Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1*

*Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex*

CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Professor Leonard
Hodgson, D.D.

The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer,
Bishop of Exeter.

The Rev. Canon E. S. Abbott,
Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

PRIESTHOOD AND REUNION

The Bishop of Brechin

UNIVERSITY THEOLOGY IN A TECHNOLOGICAL AGE

D. W. Gundry

THE MAGDALENE EVANGELICALS

J. D. Walsh

THE SCROLLS, THE LORD, AND THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

C. S. Mann

FACT AND INTERPRETATION: HISTORY AND ESCHATOLOGY

Leonard Hodgson

THE THEOLOGICAL CHALLENGE OF "DOCTOR FAUSTUS"

Ulrich Simon

A RELIGION BASED ON KINDNESS

Cecil S. Emden

CORRESPONDENCE

REVIEWS

A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.

REVIEWS

- EDWARD LANGTON: *History of the Moravian Church.*
By W. H. G. Armitage
- F. MOYLE (ed.): *Neville Gorton: Bishop of Coventry, 1943-55.*
By the Bishop of Truro
- JOHN MACMURRAY: *The Self as Agent.* By G. F. Allen
- JEAN DANIELOU: *God and Us.* By C. S. Mann
- O. BRIERE, S.J.: *Fifty Years of Chinese Philosophy, 1898-1950.*
By G. F. S. Gray
- H. F. HALLETT: *Benedict of Spinoza.* By I. T. Ramsey
- JOHN G. WILLIAMS: *Worship and the Modern Child.*
By F. A. Poulnden
- JOHN KNOX: *The Early Church and the Coming Great Church.*
By L. W. Grensted
- JENS PETER LARSEN: *Handel's Messiah: Origins, Composition, Sources.*
By Harry Gabb
- BERNARD ROSE (ed.): *Missa Quarta: Kyrie Eleison, Sanctus, Benedictus Qui Venit, Agnus Dei. Palestrina. And Missa Quarta: Creed and Gloria.* By Harry Gabb
- TUSKIN BAKER: *Communion Service in A Flat;* BERNARD ROSE: *Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis.* By Harry Gabb
- J. ALAN KAY (ed.): *Fifty Hymns by Charles Wesley.*
By Cecil Cochrane
- DON CARLO GESUALDO: *Illumina Nos.* By Cecil Cochrane
- ALAN RICHARDSON: *Science and Existence;* EDWIN BARKER: *Science and Technological Education;* H. D. WARREN: *Technical Education;* MONICA WINGATE: *Purpose in Teacher Training.* By L. B. Tirrell
- CHARLES OMAN: *English Church Plate.* By Walter Hussey
- RAYMOND ABBA: *Principles of Christian Worship: With Special Reference to the Free Churches.* By G. J. Inglis
- HUMPHREY WHISTLER: *False Alternatives at the Reformation.*
By Gordon Huelin
- KENNETH N. ROSS: *The Thirty-Nine Articles.* By Frederick Tindall
- JONATHAN HANAGHAN: *Society, Evolution and Revelation.*
By C. E. Hudson

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Professor LEONARD HODGSON, D.D., is Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN (the Right Reverend ERIC GRAHAM, D.D., whose impending retirement has recently been announced) was Fellow and Dean of Oriel College, Oxford, from 1919 to 1925 and Principal of Cuddesdon College from 1929 to 1944.

The Reverend D. W. GUNDRY is Warden of Reichel Hall, Bangor, and Dean of the Faculty of Theology in the University College of North Wales.

The Reverend C. S. MANN, O.S.B., is a Novice of Nashdom Abbey.

Mr J. D. WALSH, formerly a Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge, is now Fellow and Tutor in Modern History at Jesus College, Oxford.

Mr CECIL S. EMDEN is Emeritus Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.

The Reverend ULRICH SIMON is Lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament at King's College, London.

- A. ALLAN MCARTHUR : *The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform.* By Harold Riley
- M. F. TOAL (tr. and ed.): *The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers. Vol. I*; KENNETH MACKENZIE : *The Prayer Book Epistles*; DAVID M. PATON and JOHN T. MARTIN : *Paragraphs For Sundays and Holy Days.* By Harold Riley
- E. I. WATKIN : *Roman Catholicism in England from the Reformation to 1950.* By Kenneth N. Ross
- DONALD HUGHES : *What Kind of Education?*; C. A. COULSON : *Some Problems of the Atomic Age.* By the Bishop of Willesden
- ADAM FOX : *God is an Artist.* By the Bishop of Willesden
- A. GRAHAM IKIN : *Victory over Suffering.* By Reginald Cant
- SHELDON B. QUINCER (ed.): *Matthew Henry's Sermon Outlines.* By H. G. G. Herklots
- HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON : *Ad Clerum.* By the Bishop of Willesden
- G. H. COOK : *The English Cathedral.* By Seiriol Evans
- J. S. PURVIS (ed.): *The York Cycle of Mystery Plays.* By A. R. B. Fuller
- JOOST DE BLANK : *"Un-Comfortable Words".* By George Reindorp
- BRO. ROGER, C.R. : *So Easy to Love.* By T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E.
- AEMILIANA LOHR : *The Great Week.* By Kenneth N. Ross
- L. HODGSON : *Faith and Freedom. Vol. II.* By Marcus Knight
- KARL BARTH : *Church Dogmatics. Vol. II, The Doctrine of God. Pt. 2. Vol. IV, The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Pt. I.* By C. J. Barker
- PAUL EDWARDS and ARTHUR PAP (eds.): *A Modern Introduction to Philosophy.* By Robin Anstey
- H. P. OWEN : *Revelation and Existence—A Study in the Theology of Rudolph Bultmann.* By Raymond Chapman
- C. A. SIMPSON : *Composition of the Book of Judges.* By U. E. Simon
- R. M. GRANT : *The Letter and the Spirit.* By Reginald Cant

EDITORIAL

THE PREFACE to the new Crockford, in dealing with the Anglican-Presbyterian Report, takes occasion to point out how bad a press the Anglican side of the case received. It goes on to make some generalizations about the relations between the Church and the Press, which we hope will be read with care, for it is really time that the Church took this subject seriously. We ourselves venture to add one or two comments.

First our own contacts are sufficient to assure us that there is a tremendous amount of goodwill in Fleet Street. One very tangible expression of it is the large sum of money subscribed for the restoration of St Bride's. Further we cannot expect the Press to be uniformly favourable. Part of its duty is criticism and we cannot expect ourselves to be exempt. Nevertheless the Church owes a tremendous debt to the great organs of public opinion for the way in which they open their columns to religious articles and offer wide publicity to ecclesiastical causes. Certainly no one who knows London well would dream of denying how much a large section of the Press has done since the war for the restoration of Church life in the City and diocese. Again it is important to remember the very close and happy relations between the Church and the provincial press. Many of the local papers regularly carry series of religious articles compiled in conjunction with the neighbouring clergy. Some of them are of a high standard and convey the message of the pulpit into homes where the written word is more easily received and digested than the spoken.

Finally we agree with the Editor of Crockford that the work of the Church Information Board, or its equivalent, should be emphasized and extended. Particularly should the clergy in the Church Assembly take cognisance of this need. A body of professional men whose primary duty is that of publicity should not be content to stultify their aim by neglecting so vital an instrument for bringing their efforts to fruition.

The Editor of Crockford has done well to set out clearly the progress so far made in the discussion on Church Courts. Much the most important part of that discussion deals with the court of Final Appeal. It has generally been assumed that the revision of the canons would be used as an opportunity to get rid of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, whose authority in cases of doctrine, suggests the Editor, many churchmen have long refused to recognize. The abolition of its jurisdiction was recommended, he continues, by both the Canon Law Commission and the Church Courts Commission. It was also recommended by the majority of speeches in the subsequent debate in the Assembly. "The matter has now gone to another Commission which has instructions to draft a measure along the lines indicated by the Assembly debate, so it is to be assumed that the Final Court of Appeal in doctrinal cases will be constituted on the lines recommended by the original Church Courts Commission". We agree with the Editor's summing up of the history and we only hope that his forecast of the future turns out to be correct. It is very important for the prestige of the Church and for its administration in the immediate future that some form of canon-law revision should be accepted. We could imagine few things better calculated to render the whole scheme abortive than to link it with an attempt to consolidate the position of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as at present constituted, as the Court of Final Appeal in doctrinal cases. The overwhelming vote of the clergy would be against such a measure.

It is somewhat startling but immensely cheering to find that the publisher, James Clarke, has thought it worth while at this time of day to issue a new edition of Westcott's *St John*. First published in the Speaker's Commentary of 1880 the book was quickly recognized as a long way ahead of its contemporaries in thoroughness (although it was on the Authorized Version and not on the Greek), and in sympathy of understanding. It is of course now out-dated through its ignorance of the Koiné, of the literary history of the New Testament, and of such background material as looms so large in Dodd's volume. It is however astonishingly modern in its appraisal of the theological purpose of the author and its attempt at a consequent re-valuation of the historical element in the gospel. This up-to-dateness may be due to the fact that, as far as English studies go, it was a pioneer in this field. The line was ably followed by

Hoskyns and Davey, and helped to open up the whole discussion of the meaning of history which is of such tremendous importance today.

The present edition has an admirable introduction by Adam Fox. He points out very clearly the mingled strength and weakness of the commentary from the point of view of the modern reader. One could add to the list of advantages the fact that it gives you nearly everything you want to know. Commentaries can be divided into good or bad according as they display, or fail to display, this particular quality. Some of the most scholarly fail ever to realize what the reader wants, while a few of the more popular as conspicuously succeed. Westcott still has something for all. Whether you are student, teacher, preacher, or just enquiring reader, you are not likely to find the price of this volume (18s. 6d.) badly invested.

We publish elsewhere in this number an article that arises out of the important conference held in March at Cambridge on the subject of theological teaching in the universities. For ourselves we hope that that teaching will not become too closely related to the purely professional need of either clergy or schoolmasters. Both have seminaries, training colleges, or other departments where their technical needs can and should be met. The university course *per contra* should be maintained as an opportunity for the pursuit of knowledge and for intellectual discipline. This is not to say that the student should not be encouraged to carry his thinking through to a conclusion. If the historical and critical is the best method of study at this stage, it is still absurd to leave the student with the impression that the development of Christian doctrine ceased in 451 or that he has mastered the meaning and importance of a document when he has learnt to distinguish the component parts from which it was constructed. But this is a matter for the tutor rather than for the examiner. Every student should be encouraged to read more widely than the syllabus demands.

If we ourselves were asked to criticize the present system of theological teaching in the universities we should draw attention to the small inducement given for the study of Hebrew, at any rate in the ancient universities. There the almost exclusively classical training of both teachers and taught is manifested in a natural, but none the less regrettable, neglect of oriental languages, particularly in

Anglican circles. The result is to produce a really grave deficiency in Old Testament studies, as is evidenced by the decreasing number of Anglican divines who venture to write on the subject.

At the opposite pole of theology, one would like to suggest that, even at the cost of over-loading the curriculum, all students should be expected to give some attention to apologetics. To-day the need for an adequate defence of Christianity and for a progressive attack on the intellectual strong-points of infidelity hardly requires emphasis. Nowhere can the need be so adequately supplied as in the Universities. Indeed the call for such a developed and expert apologia is paramount in the university itself. If the students could be thoroughly versed in it and see it in operation at the seats of learning they would never be afraid to meet their enemies in the parochial gates.

PRIESTHOOD AND REUNION

THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN

IN ALMOST all discussions on the great question of Christian reunion, whether public controversies or the sober enquiries of theologians, it is the Episcopate which seems to have been the great stone of stumbling. The existence and the powers of Bishops are still the crucial element in such discussions, and though it is widely agreed that there is no hope for reunion except on an Episcopal basis, that purely practical conclusion does not settle any of the relevant theological problems. It is natural that all this attention should have been paid to the question of Episcopacy, partly because of its long history and partly because the outward difference between an Episcopally ordered communion and one not so ordered is particularly obvious. But there is reason to think that this very obviousness has been misleading, and that there is a far less obvious issue which is more fundamental. This issue is concerned not with *magisterium* but with *sacerdotium*; i.e., with the priestly character of the Ministry, and not with its administrative jurisdiction. We are still concerned with Bishops; and must remember that, as the early terminology makes plain, the Bishop was *the sacerdos*. But there is need to pay more attention to the inherent character of that office which according to "Catholic" theology, is common to Bishops and Priests alike, than to the merely governmental aspect of the Episcopate. (Or perhaps we should say "aspects"; for these are manifold, and range from the most deplorable "prelacy" to the mildest kind of constitutionalism).

Where the maxim about accepting the *fact* of Episcopacy apart from any theory about it obtains, this issue of *sacerdotium* inevitably escapes notice. It is quite easy for a reunion conference to agree that there should be *episcopi* throughout the reunited Church as a matter of administrative convenience; it might be equally easy, however, to try alternative arrangements by way of experiment. For example, on grounds of convenience and general utility there is much to be said for the Presbyterian system.

But the crucial question remains: is the authentic ministry of the Church a priestly ministry or not? and a question inextricably bound up with it is, Has the Church itself a priestly character? It will be interesting to watch developments here in the Protestant Communion and see how far the "Catholicity of Protestantism" will be allowed or encouraged to go. Recent years have seen a notably increased stress among them on the idea of the Church as such, and its essential plan in the Gospel scheme, even to the acceptance of the rather drastic maxim *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*; and for practical purposes we need not enquire whether this is a new development or a return to an original emphasis which, in some quarters at least, had become obscured. However that may be, the divinely ordained place of the Church in the scheme of salvation is to-day not merely acknowledged but quite definitely stressed by Protestant theologians; it is strongly asserted to be, as St Paul has taught us, the Body of Christ.

Further, there is a large measure of agreement that the place of the Church in the Divine plan for man's salvation involves also the existence of a Ministry therein, called by God to its work. Probably the most characteristic view amongst the Protestant Communion is that a ministry of some kind is of the *esse* of the Church, but that the exact form which it takes and the methods by which it is constituted and set apart are, relatively, matters of indifference which a Christian community itself can modify from time to time as may seem expedient. So the claim may be made for any particular type of ministry that it is of the *bene esse* of the Church, but for no particular type that it is of the *esse* of the Church; though the latter claim may and must be made for the existence of a ministry of some kind. This is a perfectly intelligible point of view: it is also perfectly intelligible that those who hold it should be somewhat impatient with the Episcopalian rigidity which regards the Episcopal form of ministry as the only form properly admissible for the Church as a whole, and therefore as itself of the *esse* of the Church. It is one thing to acknowledge, on practical grounds, that there is little hope of a genuine reunion of Christians except in an Episcopal framework; it is quite another to accept the claim that the Episcopal ministry is the only true and right continuation of that Apostolic order which our Lord provided for his Church. None the less, it may be suggested that this strong case for the universalization of Episcopacy on practical grounds does provide at least

some indication that it has intrinsic qualities which mark it off from any other form of ministry. In any case it should be noted that from the Episcopalian point of view it is the intrinsic character of Episcopacy which matters, and not its administrative convenience, or its capacity for safeguarding unity on the natural level.

What is the theology which underlies this conviction? Here there are three main considerations:

1. That the Church, as the Body of Christ, is his own instrument for carrying forward his redemptive work under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by whom, as the second Good Friday collect puts it, "the whole Body of the Church is governed and sanctified". Whatever else may be involved in this conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, this at least is essential: that it is Christ's own living instrument, prepared by himself, to carry out his work in his way; it is thus, to use a familiar phrase, the extension of the Incarnation.
2. That because the mission of the Church is what it is, Dominically ordained and Spirit guided, the connection between the Church and the ministry is integral and organic. This does not mean that the ministry lacks a status and a character of its own, but it does mean that the unity between the ministry and the rank and file of Christian folk is more fundamental and more in need of emphasis than the difference in status. Those who are called to the ministerial office are called not to "lord it over the flock" but to represent it and be its spokesmen and serve it in all humility. When they carry out the Godward duties of their office they are acting and speaking on behalf of the Church as a whole, and as the appropriate organs of the Body of Christ. It is the Body as a whole which expresses itself through them as they minister. It is easy, and disastrous, to magnify the distinction between the official ministry and the members of the Church in general, as the degradation of the word "layman" in popular speech significantly suggests. Nor is it only in those parts of Christendom where what is called "sacerdotalism" prevails that this danger exists; the traditional contrast between *ecclesia docens* and *ecclesia discens* can easily be exaggerated in practice, even in the most anti-sacerdotal circles. Teachers and learners; leaders and led; shepherds and flock: all suchlike distinctions,

however true and necessary in themselves, can be perverted only too easily into something which is neither true nor necessary; an undue magnifying of individual domination or of the prerogatives of a ministerial caste, on the one hand; and on the other hand the whittling down of the rights of the layfolk into an unquestioning obedience to official guidance—which in our own time is likely to be the guidance of a central bureaucracy.

3. None the less, it must be maintained, in spite of these real dangers, that the ministry has its own special place in the common life of the Body of Christ: its own distinctive duties and responsibilities. We have noted already the fact of its integral connection with that Body as a whole, just because its common life is shared by all its members. But our Lord's concentration on the task of training the Apostles to be the foundation-stones of the reconstituted and Spirit-endowed Church, the twelve tribes of the Israel of God, is immensely significant of the importance which he attached to the ministry; while St Paul speaks of the ministry, in its various and then largely variable forms as the gift of the Ascended Christ to his Church for the increase and building up of his Body (Eph. 4. 11 ff.), or as "set" in the Church by God himself (1 Cor. 12, 28). Expressions of this kind indicate both the oneness of the ministry with the Church and the distinctness of its divinely given vocation. Similarly St Paul urges the Thessalonians to know them that labour among them and are their spiritual leaders in the Lord and admonish them, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. The same word occurs in 1 Tim. 5. 17, where "the elders that rule well" are spoken of as deserving to be doubly honoured, especially those who labour in word and teaching. We may add two striking verses from Heb. 13. V. 7, looking back, bids the "Hebrews" "remember them that had the rule over you, which spake unto you the word of God"; while v. 17, with an eye on the present, says "Obey them that have the rule over you and submit to them: for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account". And then we have the famous passage 1 Peter 5. 1-5, with its grave stress on ministerial responsibility, the true ministerial temper and the true ministerial reward: leading up to that beautiful and

most salutary piece of advice: "All of you gird yourselves with humility to serve one another". Humility and love: the lessons of the foot-washing and of the life laid down upon the Cross. Those two great qualities are as essential for the true unity between ministers and people as they are for any reunion of Christendom which is to be more than a piece of external organization.

There is much common ground here between all communions and schools of thought which take the ministry seriously, and we may thank God for it. But we must proceed now to look rather more closely at that conception of priestliness which informs or infects not only the Roman Catholic view of the ministry, but the Orthodox and Anglican interpretation of it also.

What is Priesthood? Its general character and aim is set before us, with admirable clarity, in the familiar and memorable words of Heb. 5. The main features to which our attention is drawn are these:

(i) Every High priest is taken from among men; he belongs essentially to those whom he is to serve, and shares their nature.

(ii) He is appointed on behalf of his fellow men to act for them in their Godward relations.

(iii) The object of his appointment to his priestly office is that he may offer to God gifts and sacrifices on behalf of the people's sins; i.e. in acknowledgement of them, and to obtain pardon for them.

(iv) He is not to regard himself as separated off, by his priestly office, from those on whose behalf he exercises it; he is compassed with infirmity—spiritual and moral frailty—just as they are; and therefore is not only qualified to bear gently with his ignorant and erring brethren, but is also under obligation to offer sacrifice for himself as well as for his people in general; he needs the pardon of God no less than they do.

(v) The priestly office is not one which a man can arrogate to himself or attain on his own initiative; it can be exercised only by those who are called to it by God, as Aaron was at the beginning of the Mosaic dispensation.

Such are the underlying principles of Priesthood; they are manifested most clearly in the classical example of the Levitical Priesthood, the Priesthood which the writer to the Hebrews

describes as being "after the order of Aaron". The object at which this Priesthood aims is unity and reconciliation between the people and their God; that unity which is broken by sin and cannot be restored without reconciliation. There have been many theories about the origin and significance of sacrifice; but this epistle insists that the fundamental aim of priesthood and sacrifice alike is to deal with sin and with the wrong relations between God and man which are the inevitable result of sin. This is indeed the deepest and abiding need of mankind. And the function of a priest is to be a bridgemaker—pontifex—between God and man; bringing them together. By virtue of the priest's human nature this bridge was firmly fixed at the human end; and by virtue of his appointment to the priestly office by the call of God, it was hoped that the bridge was secured *a parte divina* also, and made available for its two-way traffic. The main form which this traffic took was sacrifice; and it was a two-way traffic because the victims offered in sacrifice by men were first given for that purpose by God himself, in accordance with the great principle of Lev. 17. 11: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls". Perhaps it may be noted here in passing that Priesthood and Sacrifice are correlative terms; and it is rather unfortunate that so much more attention has been given to the subject of Sacrifice than to the subject of Priesthood. And there has been a tendency to assume that the abolition of animal sacrifices has involved the abolition of Priesthood also.

But this category of "abolition" needs our attention. What was abolished by the Incarnation of the Son of God and his atoning Sacrifice on Calvary was not Priesthood or Sacrifice but the Levitical system. True Priesthood and true Sacrifice were never provided under that system; it was a pageant of types, shadows, symbols, not of reality; and it was shot through with transitoriness; nothing in it was abiding. It had two characteristics of supreme value; first, it bore witness to man's need for access to and union with God, and therefore for the remission of the sins which separate man from God; and secondly, it prepared the way for the coming of him in whom alone these needs are fully and finally met. But it had no efficacy of its own, as the writer to the Hebrews insists again and again. "For the law", he tells us, "having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, they can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer

continually, make perfect them that draw nigh. Else would they not have ceased to be offered, because the worshippers, having been once cleansed, would have had no more conscience of sins? But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." And again: "Every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins." (Heb. 10. 1-4, 11.) In short, the Levitical order is stirring and dramatic, eloquently expressive of aspirations and longings, but in the last resort it has no power to satisfy the real needs of mankind. This was something the Law could not do for all its richness of ritual and ceremonial and its moving traditions; symbolical ministrations could only confer a symbolical cleansing. Thus, to quote Hebrews again, these gifts and sacrifices "cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect, being only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation" (ib. 9. 9 f).

In contrast with all this half-light of types and symbols stands the Incarnate Lord; who has accomplished once for all that which the Mosaic dispensation could only foreshadow. "The Law made nothing perfect" (Heb. 7. 19) but Christ fulfils the Scriptures; in him, that which is perfect is come, and that which is in part is done away. "Types and shadows have their ending"; and in him we are given the divine and abiding reality: true and effective Priesthood; true and effective Sacrifice.

This is a familiar theme—*Christus Consummator*—on which there is no need to enlarge. But we must consider a little further the actual characteristics of this perfect Priesthood which our Lord exercises. There are three of these to be noted.

1. The very fact that he is a Priest means that he must "have somewhat to offer"; that is the very mark and essence of priestly ministration, as Heb. 8. 3 asserts: "Every High priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices; therefore it is necessary that this High priest also have somewhat to offer".

2. Because he is the only true Priest, dealing not with types and shadows but with realities, and exercising his ministry in the eternal world, the offering which he makes is the perfect offering. We rightly associate his offering very specially with his sacrificial death on Calvary; but we must not limit it thereto, nor make any separation between the death and the whole life and being of him

who died. Our Lord's offering of his human life to the Father is unique not only as being the life of the God-man, the Word made flesh, but for these reasons also, among others, on the human level :

(a) There was no particle of self-love in him—i.e. self-love in the sense of clinging to his mortal life in this world through lack of detachment; his self-dedication to God was whole-hearted and complete. There was no vestige of dissent in his mind and will, however great may have been the natural and blameless shrinking of his human nature from the appalling cost of his self-dedication. Whereas even in the best of men, other than our Lord, there are elements of dissent; over-ruled and out-voted, indeed, but still there; otherwise there would be absolute selflessness and that implies absolute sinlessness

(b) Even the best men, other than our Lord, have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, the glory which God means to belong to every human life. A sinless human life possesses this glory in its fullness and the life in consequence is wholly desirable and lovely. Our Lord in laying down his uniquely glorious, desirable, and lovely human life, is giving far more than any of his human brethren ever can give; men's offering can never be without blemish in the sense that his was; there is always in it that which has spoiled it to some extent, and made it less desirable to keep and therefore less costly to surrender.

(c) Because the offering of Christ is perfect, it is also eternal, and of universal availability and efficacy; whereas the individual Christian's offering besides being in itself imperfect, is marred in each case by the particular faults of the individual concerned; and therefore remains an individual offering, and not one that can be used on behalf of others. It is only when the individual's offering is united by his will and intentions with the perfect, universal, representative offering of Christ, and so covered as it were by his, that it can be accepted by God; accepted not as it is, but as the offerer, guided and purified by the Holy Spirit, means it to be; the Eternal Spirit, through Whom Christ our Lord offered himself without spot to God.

Thus the true inwardness of Our Lord's Sacrifice is his perfect offering of himself to the Father, perpetuated in heaven, and reproducing itself in the life of the Church through the Holy Spirit.

3. And the third great characteristic of our Lord's Priesthood is mediation between God and man. His perfect offering is a giving of

self; it is Love in action; no other power could make at-one-ment. The sacrificial self-giving of Incarnate Love necessarily has two aspects:

(i) from the divine side, it is Christ's offering to men, by virtue of his oneness with the Father, of that by which alone they can come into real communion with God; i.e. his own *divine* life, mediated through his humanity so that we can understand and receive it and make it our own. And

(ii) from the human side, it is Christ's offering to his Father, by virtue of his oneness with mankind, of that which alone God can accept from man; i.e. a perfect human life, entirely consecrated.

In both these aspects our Lord's offering is one and the same: himself; and it is made in both directions at once and indivisibly; because he is at once and indivisibly *totus in suis* and *totus in nostris*; perfect in Godhead and perfect in Manhood. So he is the perfect Mediator between God and man; the perfect Uniter of God and man; the perfect Priest who offers the perfect offering and is himself both the offering and the offerer.

Such, briefly and sketchily, is the Priesthood of our Lord and Saviour; and such must be the ideal priestliness flowing from him into the Church, which as his Body exists to perpetuate on earth his priestly work, in living union with him as he eternally offers himself in the heavenly places. In the magnificent words of St Peter (1 Pet. 2. 5) Christian believers "are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ". (Perhaps we should remind ourselves here that the word "spiritual" does not mean "unreal", but the exact opposite; *God is Spirit*).

Now we go on to consider the further point which is the crucial one for our present purpose. If the Church as a whole is not only a peculiar people but also a royal priesthood, as it is described in the same passage, the priesthood of the laity, the people of God, is fully established. And this is a truth of the very greatest value and significance. But if so, can there be any force in the contention that some special quality of priestliness belongs to those who have been set apart by ordination for the office and work of priests in the Church of God?

There would seem to be a three-fold answer in the affirmative to this question.

1. As we have already observed, it is a matter of almost general consent among the different Christian communions that a ministry of some kind is of the *esse* of the Church. But if this is admitted, the admission carries with it the consequence that we may rightly draw a distinction between the ministerial duties, obligations, and privileges (every Christian obligation being also a privilege) on the one hand, and on the other hand those which belong to all members of the Church in virtue of their membership. This distinction may be conceived in many different ways; but the sheer fact that it exists means that we cannot rule out *a priori* the particular distinction between the priesthood of those who are specifically called priests, and the priesthood of the people as a whole. We take this point up again in a moment. But now,

2. We need to emphasize the representative character of the ordained priesthood. It is the Church as a whole, the Spirit-bearing Body of Christ, which is the Royal Priesthood, and as such charged with the task of carrying out his priestly work until the end of time; there is no rigid line of cleavage here between the Ministry and the People of God. Thus Dr Moberly writes, in his book *Ministerial Priesthood*: "The priesthood of the Ministry is nothing distinct in kind from the priesthood of the Church. The ordained priests are priestly only because it is the Church's prerogative to be priestly; and because they are by ordination specialized and empowered to exercise ministerially and organically the prerogatives of the Body as a whole. Those who actually celebrate [the sacraments] do but organically represent and act for the whole". Those adverbs, "ministerially" and "organically" mean, I suppose, that priestly actions are carried out *on behalf of* the Church as a whole by men who themselves *belong integrally* to the Church, and have, so to speak, no claims as against it. The priest is essentially a representative, the *persona* of the congregation—not indeed by human election or delegation, but by divine appointment—and apart from a congregation he lacks his true and normal context. It is the Church as a whole, e.g. which offers the Eucharist, through the instrumentality of the priest; the liturgical words and actions of the priest are those of the Church as a worshipping community; and the whole picture is obscured and distorted when the priest is regarded as carrying out, if one may put it so, a solo performance in the presence of a more or less passive congregation. It is worth noting that in recent years there has been a strong movement in the Church

of Rome itself to insist that worshippers should not be content merely to "hear mass"—a dangerous phrase—but should also actively pray the prayers of the mass together with the celebrant. The "clericalising" of the Eucharist—or of any other service—is a real evil, and destructive of the true principles and ethics of Christian worship. But

3. We cannot stop at this point. The truth of what has just been stated is not inconsistent with another truth: viz., that the ordained ministers of the Church nonetheless have their own divinely-given vocation; have special duties to perform which cannot rightly be performed by any and every layman who may feel disposed to undertake them. As in a human body the several organs, though acting for the whole body—acting, if we care to adopt Dr Moberly's terms, ministerially and organically on its behalf, or, in a representative capacity—yet have their particular and inalienable characteristics and functions; so in the life and activity of the Body of Christ the ordained priests of the Church have their special characteristics and functions which are not transferable to the unordained. Dr Moberly's words, previously quoted, are followed immediately by his own statement of this principle. "The executive right", he says, "the power to represent and act for and wield ministerially the capacities of the whole [body], is not indiscriminate". In other words, all members have not the same office; the life of the Church is the life of the whole Body, but the Body itself cannot live fully without certain members to express its life and carry out its functions. These members are the gift of Christ, or the Father, to his Church. It is this fact which lies behind the traditional doctrine that ordination to the priesthood confers what is technically called "character"; a character which is indelible; so that though a priest may be suspended from the performance of his office for grave reasons, he can never cease to be a priest.

Before proceeding to a concrete illustration of priesthood in action, it may be worth while to note briefly two misconceptions which have arisen from ignoring the principles which we have just been considering.

The first of these is *false sacerdotalism*. This is generally the result of regarding the priestliness of the ministry as differing in character from the true and ideal priestliness of Christ; so that it stands between God and his people as a kind of barrier, instead of being a means of their free and confident access to the throne of grace. Such

priestliness is plainly different in kind from the priestliness of the Church as a whole.

The second misconception is false *anti-sacerdotalism*, arising from error as to the real nature and purpose of priesthood. This error is often due to reaction from the first misconception, but sometimes, also it springs from the belief that actual priesthood and sacrifice belong solely to the Old Testament Dispensation, and that they have been done away once for all by the life and work of Christ. The correction of this mistaken impression is supplied, as we have seen, by the Epistle to the Hebrews; which shows that the Levitical priesthood and sacrifices were only *imperfect types and shadows* of the true; symbols void of efficacy; and that the living reality of Priesthood and sacrifice is found for the first time, and abidingly, in the work of our Lord, to whom alone *belongs* the true and truly effective priesthood. His priesthood abides for ever, unchangeable; unchangeable not as a monument, static and motionless, but in the ceaseless exercise of unimpeded activity. "My Father *worketh* hitherto, and I work", says our Lord; God is *actus purus*, and the saving work of Christ, though accomplished once for all, is no mere past achievement, but an abiding energy; the power of his endless life which is still eternally active to save. As Charles Wesley sings—

Thine offering still continues now
 Before the righteous Father's view;
 Thyself the Lamb for ever slain,
 Thy Priesthood doth unchanged remain;
 Thy years, O God, can never fail,
 Nor Thy blest work within the veil.

It is this dynamic priesthood which belongs to the Church by divine gift, and is exercised therein by those who have been called and set apart for that specific task, in the ministry of priesthood.

This article began with an expression of belief that the most fundamental difference between "Catholics" and "Protestants", to use convenient if somewhat question-begging terms, is to be found not in Episcopacy as such, but in the conception of Priesthood. We may proceed now to consider one concrete and practical example which may help us to get the issue as clear as possible. And for our present purpose the most useful example to take seems to be not the Eucharist, on which the various Christian communions have drawn much nearer to a common mind, and may hope to draw nearer yet,

but the Sacrament of Penance : which has a regular place in Roman, Orthodox, and Anglican practice : but none, or practically none, in the non-Episcopal communions. There is presumably little or no theoretical bar in Protestant theology to the requirement of public penance on the part of notorious offenders, such as was common in the early Church, whatever practical objections may be made on grounds of moral and spiritual expediency. And not long ago an admirable paper was read at a "Ministers' Fraternal" by a Church of Scotland minister, with the title of "the Pardon in Public Worship", which maintained that the Kirk has a perfect right to exact penitential discipline from its members, not publicly, but by a method of private confession. This thesis was approved by most of the Church of Scotland ministers present, but there was unanimous agreement that none of their lay folk would submit themselves to such discipline. However that may be, the real point is not the penitential aspect, nor the actual confession, but the claim which Anglicans and others make that the priest is empowered not merely to hear the confession but to give absolution. This is crucial.

When a man is ordained to the Priesthood, in the Anglican communion, part of the formula used by the Bishop when he lays his hands upon the head of the man he is ordaining is this : "Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained". These last words deliberately take up those which St John tells us were spoken by the risen Lord to his disciples on Easter night. We must not indeed narrow them down, or find their fulfilment solely in the formal process of sacramental confession and absolution; for it is impossible to proclaim the Gospel message faithfully at all without some remission of sins being bestowed on those who accept the message with repentance and faith, and without some real retention of the sins of those who reject the message. The proclamation of Christ crucified and risen can never leave a man exactly as he was before; it is bound to make him either better or worse, according to his response. But granting all this quite freely and fully, Anglicans may still maintain that their Ordinal is right in making this special connection between the Lord's Easter charge and the commission given to a priest at his ordination to absolve sinners who come to him with their confessions or, if need be, to withhold absolution when there is some

plain failure of repentance—as there is sometimes even when the penitential discipline is voluntary. “As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you” are the immediately preceding words of Christ; i.e. the Church is constituted and sent by him to carry forward his own saving work in the power of the Holy Spirit; and, as part of that work, to give absolution to those who humbly and heartily desire it. And it is of course the priest *as the appointed representative of the Church*, and not as a private individual, however wise and learned, who deals with those matters.

It will be convenient at this point to set out the official form of absolution which is provided for the priest’s use :

Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left *power* to *His Church* to absolve *all sinners*, who truly repent and believe in Him: of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences :

And by His *authority* committed to *me*, I absolve *thee* from all thy sins: in the Name . . .

We should note here, first, the very careful balance of the clauses, and the correspondence between them; and secondly, the fact that this form does not stop at the prayer, as Protestants might wish: it goes on to the word of power—*Absolvo te*. Thus the claim that priestly absolution is a real gift and *is now being bestowed* is made in the clearest and most explicit way.

It is not within the scope of this article to attempt any forecast of future movements towards reunion, or of the likelihood of approach to theological agreement on the somewhat thorny subject which has been raised; though two comparatively recent developments make for hopefulness. The first of these, already mentioned, is the increased stress in many Christian communions on the idea of the Church and its integral place in the Gospel: the second is the growth of brotherliness and candour between Christians of different denominational allegiances, and a corresponding readiness to make careful, patient, and sympathetic enquiries before issuing an adverse verdict on some *prima facie* uncongenial feature in the faith or practice of this or that communion.

Moreover, those of us who have the advantage of being sexagenarians have seen in our own life-time an immense change in the whole climate of Protestant-minded opinion on this question of Confession. In characteristic writings of 40-50 years ago it was condemned root and branch as unhealthy, unmanly, un-English

(with no suggestion that it might find favour in Scotland!), and humiliating—which it certainly and beneficially is. More recently, however, thanks in part to the rise of scientific psychology, it has come to be recognized that a man often benefits greatly by getting his moral and spiritual troubles off his chest through confession, instead of bottling them up and absorbing the poison into his system. Confession as such, in fact, is now widely commended and advocated for this reason. But this progress in understanding still leaves the strictly theological issue untouched; that is, the claim that a priest of the Church has the right and duty not merely to hear the confession and offer counsel, but also to give absolution; a liberating word of power, by virtue of the Lords' own authority committed to him in his priesthood. That claim has an essential and ineradicable place in the official Anglican position; it is no private whim of the Anglo-Catholic school of thought. And this article must end, as it began, by stating the conviction that in the sphere of "Order" the crucial issue, both theological and practical, which requires to be faced by all who seek reunion, is not the character or extent of Episcopal governance in the Church, but the intrinsic nature of that *sacerdotium* which, in Anglican belief, Bishops and Priests alike are appointed to exercise.

More than three hundred years before Dom Gregory Dix's article in "The Apostolic Ministry" launched the *Shaliach* thunderbolt into theological circles—whether *brutum fulmen* or not we do not here pause to enquire—something rather similar was stated in all innocence and with no controversial intent by a more characteristically Anglican divine: George Herbert. "Christ", he wrote,¹ "being not to continue on earth, but after he had fulfilled the work of reconciliation to be received up into heaven, he constituted Deputies in His place, and these are Priests. . . . Out of this character of the Priesthood may be plainly gathered both the Dignity thereof and the Duty: The Dignity, in that a Priest may do what Christ did, and by his authority, and as his Vicegerent. The Duty, in that a Priest is to do what Christ did, and after his manner".

¹ *A Priest to the Temple*, ch. 1.

UNIVERSITY THEOLOGY IN A TECHNOLOGICAL AGE

D. W. GUNDRY

I

THIS paper is deliberately provocative, because the conscience of the Church needs to be stirred in regard to its attitude towards its own science, theology, and the opportunities for better theological education which the universities afford. What is the task of theological departments in our universities? The question is easily answered. To be departments of theology, and not departments of semitics and hellenistic greek and of aspects of history, anthropology, sociology, psychology and philosophy masquerading as theology. One of the present-day troubles with theology is that it suffers from a sense of inferiority: the banished queen of the sciences has slipped into the back door of the newer universities and finding herself a little cold-shouldered by the up and coming sciences has, perhaps foolishly, allied herself to the already slightly faded humanities.

You will notice that I refer to the newer universities in particular; and I am bound to do that for several reasons. The newer universities are collectively the more important, or are likely to become so, if only by weight of numbers. There are about 55,000 full time students in the newer universities, whereas there are only 30,000 in the older. They also tend to be more scientifically minded than the older seats of learning. And they are better organized to benefit from the great contemporary patrons of learning, notably the State and big industrial and commercial undertakings. Of the £26 million which the Treasury allocated to the universities in 1955-56 only £8 million went to the older universities, while £18 million went to the newer. The University of Oxford raises £1 million with difficulty to repair its old buildings, the University of Manchester with ease to put up new buildings. Overall the newer universities have accomplished in a century what the older have taken many

centuries to achieve. This, I know, is an over-simplified statement, but I put it to you to emphasize the difference.

And a difference there certainly is between the old-fashioned and the new-fashioned universities in respect of theology. It is not that their curricula are on paper so very different, but their ethos certainly is; and the ethos affects those who read theology. By the old-fashioned universities, a term of which some will approve, I mean Oxford, Cambridge, Durham which copied the Oxbridge pattern—at least in its Durham division, the four Scottish universities, Trinity College, Dublin, and St David's College, Lampeter. Here theology has a different, a privileged position. While the curricula in all these institutions bear the stamp of the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of this, when liberal biblical criticism and theology were making their impact, as elsewhere, theology in the older universities is not altogether cut off from their religious life and worship. The theological professors and dons have high standing and are closely connected with the Church, there are college chapels and chaplains who are often teachers of theology, and there are university sermons and special religious foundations and so on. And in Scotland in some ways they preserve these connections between university theology and the work of the Church better than in England. In short, tradition is too strong to allow university policy in regard to theology to change unduly.

But in the new-fashioned—and some would add up-to-date—universities the position is different. Theology is just one—and a small one—among many academic disciplines, and is, in many instances, a newcomer. Moreover, university policy with regard to theology—whether to admit it at all or to shape it when admitted—is often, in part, in the hands of laymen, who do not always understand what theology is. The efficient high-pressure vice-chancellor, the professor of physics who is a leading authority on nuclear energy, the professor of economics so much consulted on problems of modern society and the professor of French who knows the latest things that are being talked about in the existentialist caves of Paris very often have ideas about theology which are quaint and outmoded. This is not always the case. Some universities have been served splendidly by laymen who are alert Christians, often more clear-sighted theologically than professional theologians. The University of Nottingham, for example, is particularly fortunate, for it has a department of Christian theology. But even this is

perhaps a precarious exception. If the ethos of Nottingham, one of our newest universities with little or no traditional respect for theology, changes at some future date, then there may also be a change in the department of Christian theology. If, as at Leeds, a chair of the history and philosophy of religion can be converted into a chair of theology, as it was most adventurously only a few years back, we must not suppose that such a conversion is irrevocable.

On the whole theology in the newer universities is only theology in name. A little doctrine may be brought in to save face; but generally the syllabuses tend to be bogged down with biblical linguistics¹ and textual criticism and a mixture of history, anthropology and philosophy, as if the whole thing were just another humanity—the study of man's religious quest, usually in the distant past, and not of the being of God and of God's relationship with men now. The Victoria University of Manchester, as I dared to point out recently,² is aptly so named. It is certainly Victorian in that the one compulsory subject which all theological students must read is the comparative study of religions—or, as it is miscalled, comparative religion: such a programme is unlikely to do more than encourage people to be comparatively religious.³ But it is not only the comparative study of religions, my own specialism, which is to blame. I frequently meet, as you do no doubt, young men and women who find university theology not only disappointing intellectually but, even worse, spiritually boring, because so much of it has little connection with religion as a living phenomenon relevant to present-day life. Is it little wonder that they develop a religious duplicity, following their theological curricula for the purposes of examinations and getting jobs, but joining Rome or some esoteric brand of Anglo-Catholicism or the I.V.F. or, more dangerous, politics, music, art, and poetry, for their personal spiritual satisfaction?⁴ There is far too much theological double-thinking going on; and the blame for it lies in no small measure at the doors of theological curricula as they now are and have been for the past several generations. Theology is little more than a humanity—and a humanity without the serene death-mask of the classics or the chatterbox adolescence of English and other modern literatures or the slick up-to-dateness of the social studies. This goes as much for the older universities as for the new: as I explained earlier, the saving feature of theology at the older seats of learning

is its close connection, by tradition, with their religious life and worship.

That the universities themselves regard theology in this light is clear from the manner in which theology is usually lumped together with the liberal arts in its organization. It is still clearer from such publications as the annual and quinquennial reports of that rich fairy god-mother, the University Grants Committee, which allocates the astronomic Treasury grant to the several universities. If you refer, for example, to the *U.G.C. Returns* for the year 1955-56, you will find theology included in the statistics relating to subjects and numbers of candidates; and there it is sandwiched between philosophy and psychology on the one hand and languages on the other. It is possible to exaggerate this placing, since it is simply an administrative device: yet it shows how the ever-increasingly powerful professional administrative mind views theology. In the main text of the *U.G.C. quinquennial reports* you will find theology mentioned not at all.

2

If the queen of sciences is to be revitalized and re-established as theology, the study of God and his dealings with men, then a bolder policy is called for in the universities. But who makes university policy in this, as in other respects?

Theoretically—some might be tempted at first sight to suppose, ideally, where theology is concerned—the Church (I use the term in its widest sense) through its leaders, in co-operation with the professional university administrators, should determine how theology is to develop, since the Church is—or ought to be—the great patron and guardian of its professional science. If you look up the *U.G.C. quinquennial reports* you will see there the names of members of a number of sub-committees: there is a sub-committee on medical education (almost all of whom are medical men), a sub-committee on technology (almost all of whom are technologists), and so on. One might have supposed that there would be a theological sub-committee consisting of, say, the Bishop of X and the Bishop of Y, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the Moderator of the Free Church Council, the Dean of Z, the Regius Professor of Divinity at one of the older Universities, a theological professor from one of the Scottish universities and a theological don from a red-brick university, with one or two

others, perhaps interested and informed laymen. But there is no such sub-committee; and perhaps it is just as well. The *odium theologicum*, still persistent in Church circles, makes its existence impossible; and we should note, in passing, that the deviscerated nature of theology in some of the universities is in no small degree the product of inter-denominational bickerings amongst Christians themselves. When one considers the sectarian controversy in education over the last one hundred years, it is almost miraculous that theology has ever entered the newer universities at all.

But there is another reason why the Church has little say in university policy with regard to theology—and, indeed, why it should not have, as things are at the moment. It is that the Church itself has not had a very good record in regard to theology of recent years. On the whole Free-churchmen have, I am, as an Anglican, ashamed to say, a better record than the Church of England and its sister churches. The character of Church leadership has changed: there are very few theologians, for example, on the episcopal bench; the episcopate is increasingly recruited from what has been dubbed of late “the establishment”—usually meaning an administrative class.⁵ It is one of the sad things about the Church in this century that it has built up a kind of complex business organization, which alas! produces very little. As the Church it produces little theology and few theologians. One is almost tempted to say that the universities no longer produce theologians for the Church but in spite of the Church.

In the field of theological education and research the present Anglican set-up is quite disgraceful; and it is doubtful whether the Free-churches have anything to be excessively proud about either. Our theological colleges are really private schools quite inadequate to meet present-day needs. This is no criticism of the men who staff them: they do a wonderful job within their limits, but are none-the-less the victims of the system. It is just absurd to suppose that the Church’s great work of theological education and research can any longer be best done by two men and a boy paid a mere pittance out of the profits of colleges with thirty or forty students. Other professions would not tolerate such Victoriana. It would be a wonderful thing if during the next few decades the Church could hand over more and more of its theological work to the universities, so bringing the universities more intimately into the life of the Church.⁶ But I shall touch on this point again later.

In fact, the people who for some time have decided, and who still decide such policy are the relatively small number of powerful men who run the universities—the vice-chancellors and senates. It is true that the governing bodies of the universities, the courts and councils, can bring pressure to establish, or not establish, theological departments; but, in no small measure, they are often guided by the professional administrators, and, in any case, they have no say in the detailed working out of policy. Fortunately, there have not been lacking good Christian men in the important offices of our newer universities. There are now only a few universities without some kind of theological or quasi-theological departments. Liverpool, Reading, and Leicester are now the only universities with no theology of any kind. Even Exeter, Southampton and Hull, among our newest universities, offer some kind of theological courses; but it is doubtful whether the Church is making as much use as it might of these facilities.

One must not, however, imagine that the building-up of university theology has been entirely the work of lay administrators. There has also been a small number of red-brick theological dons who have been at work behind this remarkable development; and, as members of their university senates, their influence has been incalculable. But still their number is very small. At the older universities—at Oxbridge and in Scotland—they have, as I have already indicated, a considerable say in things because of the dignity traditionally accorded to theology; but at the newer universities the number of theologians who have any real influence on the inner workings of these institutions is quite small.

Christian people have for too long vainly imagined that peripheral influence, through the university council, for instance, through the S.C.M., through discussion groups for staff and students, will educate the universities in Christian truth. And not nearly enough attention has been paid to the recruitment of Christian men and women to leading positions in the universities. I do not want to digress here into the wider subjects of Christian influence in our universities; but I do want to stress the importance of seeing that practising Christians are appointed to posts, particularly senior posts. The tragedy is that the field is often so poor. One wonders whether anyone in the Church officially notes the university vacancies for theological chairs and lectureships and suggests to

suitable men that they should apply for them: chance seems to be left in control.⁷

The people who should have most say in university theological policy are, of course, not the professional administrators but theologians themselves. And here I would like to air a grumble about them. I am not minimizing what they have done for theology hitherto; but there are two respects in which they often seem to have missed the mark. First, university theologians are often too frightened of their arts and science colleagues. There is too much deference to the lay mind. It may well be that the humanistic cast of our theological curricula is due to the theologians' dis-inclination to stand up to his humanist colleagues, who so often cannot think of theology except as a discipline with an ideological basis similar to their own. And secondly, university theologians tend, in consequence, to take a limited view of theology. I want to conclude, therefore, by pointing out in a general way how our present theological curricula are unsatisfactory and how they could be improved.

But before doing this I want to mention something very significant for the Church itself in the modern development of theology in the universities. Before 1871 the theology of the older universities, the only universities with any theology at that time, was exclusively Anglican. On the whole the modern universities, when they modified their charters which at first forbade religious teaching, were mainly encouraged in their prosecution of theological studies by Nonconformists; and theology was kept within definite non-denominational bounds. To-day all the major denominations are represented in the theological departments of our universities. Cambridge now has a Presbyterian divinity professor and Free-Church divinity lecturers; Oxford has several non-Anglican lecturers in its faculty. King's College, London, an Anglican foundation with an Anglican theological department, is beginning to take on a new shape with two non-Anglican professors and a non-Anglican reader in theological subjects. On the other hand Manchester has one Anglican theological professor. Birmingham likewise, has Anglicans and Nonconformists, including even Roman Catholic recognized teachers, in its theological department. This throwing together of theologians and their pupils of different church allegiances in a common task is bound to have a far reaching influence on the Church of the future, and may prove a powerful hidden factor in Church unity. This is particularly the case with modern universities;

for in them there can be no denominationalism. It may well be that their very secularism will force the theologians of the future to work out a common ground of worship to gather up their work together as a common offering to our Lord.

3

And now my closing remarks about our theological curricula. They are clearly unsatisfactory to my mind for a number of reasons. First, they are not theological enough. Perhaps it was wise a generation or more ago to move slowly in order to avoid destructive controversy. But the general shape of syllabuses has changed but little: the mixture is as before. Introduction to the Old Testament, Introduction to the New, a few set books in English, selections from the Greek Testament and perhaps from the Hebrew Bible, the linguistic, literary, and textual aspects predominating; a period of Church history, usually to A.D. 451; and dogmatics often treated as the history of certain religious ideas. The whole thing a bit of a museum piece, dull, unexciting, irrelevant; and many theologians—not all—frightened of tackling the basic matter of the Christian revelation. I sometimes think that if our Lord were to visit our schools of theology he would drive us out as he did the money-changers from the temple of old. In saying this I am not pleading for neo-orthodoxy as against liberalism, for Thomism or Barthianism, Romanism or Conservative Evangelicalism: I am simply pleading for curricula which present the Christian religion as something stupendous and compelling, even if the old orthodoxies seem to have grown a bit thin. Not nearly enough attention is paid in theological syllabuses to tackling the fundamental questions which bother people to-day.⁸ Philosophical and comparative theology are barely touched as necessary concomitants of biblical exegesis; and practical theology appears not at all. There is good reason for insisting on four years for an honours degree in theology, just as many science departments are now doing for their honours courses.

Secondly, theological departments are too self-contained. The education of ministers of religion and divinity teachers and the pursuit of specialist research is, no doubt, our main function; but we have also a mission to the university as a whole. When special popular (in the best sense) theological lectures on the big themes of our religion are put on, they invariably draw a large, avid audience, as specialist lectures do not. And since the religious knowledge of

the arts or science student—or don, for that matter—is childish compared with his knowledge of his art or science, university theologians can and should do all in their power to remedy what the Church itself through its own organization has so far been unable to do. It is baffling why the Church's great concern for education stops somewhere a little way up the educational ladder. We hear so much about church schools, usually primary, occasionally modern secondary and grammar, only rarely about technical colleges, and rarer still about the universities. It is little wonder that the religious ideas of the man-in-the-pew, let alone the man-in-the-street, have never progressed much beyond the 11+ stage. Yet to-day's undergraduates are the managers and directors of the future; and they should certainly have an adult appreciation of the Christian faith, even if they cannot bring themselves to whole-hearted Church allegiance. It is, to say the least, near-sightedness on the part of the Church to try to guarantee elementary religious education for the masses, but to do almost nothing for the higher religious education of the people who will run the country in the future. Perhaps the only people who can do anything here are the staffs of university theological departments.

Thirdly, and to return to theological curricula as such: our syllabuses are far too closely geared to the humanities. I have already touched upon this; but I do so again because theologians themselves do not seem to be aware of this situation. Theology ought not to take its cues from the liberal arts. Indeed, the close identification of theology with the humanities has in part been its undoing. Once upon a time theology was the queen of the sciences; but ever since her gradual degradation to pauper status during the post-Renascence period she has clung on to the arts, which have actually proved treacherous allies, and are now themselves faced with degradation to pauperism. Theology once foolishly assumed that by currying favour with the humanities she might feed on the crumbs from the then rich table. But the crumbs are growing fewer.

In other words, and to change the metaphor to something a bit more up to date, the humanities as the shaping force of Western culture and the basis of Western education "have had it". And a good thing too; for they have no very creditable record behind them as far as theology and religion are concerned. Anyway, whether we like it or not, our new civilization will be—is already—based on science and technology; and these are not nearly as inimical to

theology, and so to the Christian religion, as is commonly made out. Scientists and technologists, if understood, and ministered to in a way that they can understand, may prove better supporters of the Christian religion than the humanists of the past, who have often made of humanism a substitute religion.

Fourthly, perhaps the greatest fault of university theologians is that they have forgotten that Christian theology is itself a technology. This point needs stressing. If theology is not an applied science, then it is an academic luxury we can barely afford. The *raison d'être* of our science is the enlightenment of men and women about God and the Gospel he gave in Christ: the aim of theology is the aim of the Church and so the aim of our Lord—to seek and to save that which was lost.

I would, therefore, plead for the inclusion of apologetics, liturgics, even homiletics, of ecclesiastical art and music, of moral theology and the large field of pastoralia within the framework of University theology. These are all legitimate branches of theology—quite as legitimate as those of the biblical scholar or the ecclesiastical historian or the dogmatic theologian. If we can bring practical theological education and research, now outside our universities, and our now rarefied, cloistered theoretical theological education and research together as one united, if complex, science, then we shall indeed be able to offer something which this new technological civilization is crying out for in its agonized heart.⁹ If we go on thinking of theology as a poor relation of the humanities, smitten with a guilty conscience, and do not think of theology as an applied science, then be sure of this, that theology won't sell. The market will be in other hands.

¹ As few theological students to-day come up to the University with any knowledge of Greek and Latin, most of them have to start the biblical languages from scratch and struggle with them for three years, after which they are soon forgotten. While some insight into the Greek Testament must be insisted on, it should not be to such an extent that there is little time left for the study of fundamental religious ideas.

² v. "The Philosophy of Religion, the Banner of a Sect", in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, June 1957.

³ The comparative study of religions is an essential constituent of modern theological education, but it should be closely linked to systematic theology and not regarded as a substitute for theology.

⁴ Not enough attention has been paid to the arts as substitute religions. Perhaps the close identification of theology with the humanities is in part responsible.

⁵ This remark is not intended to encourage the present fashion for bishop-baiting. The Church to-day must have good administrators; but unfortunately the need for adventurously-minded theologian-administrators, with a diversity of outlooks and backgrounds, has been neglected over the last few decades.

⁶ Because its theological colleges are virtually private establishments, it is difficult for the Church of England to effect large-scale reform in its own field of theological education. Despite the valuable suggestions put forward in *Training for the Ministry*, the Final Report of the Archbishops' Commission, 1944, unfortunately out of print, Anglican theological colleges hardly differ now from when they were established in the last century. They should obviously be fewer, larger and placed in university centres where their teaching and research could be linked up with theological faculties.

⁷ It is no secret that a few years ago there was the greatest difficulty in filling a senior Old Testament chair at one of the older universities. Many felt that the professorship should be laicized; and its traditional status was only maintained by securing a scholar from America. Young Anglican specialist theologians need encouragement. There are many valuable opportunities for postgraduate work. v. under "Theology" in *United Kingdom Postgraduate Awards*, published by the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth. Following the recommendation of the Ministry of Education, many local education authorities are now prepared to extend awards to enable graduates to read for post-graduate degrees in divinity. Suitably qualified theological honoursmen may also apply for Ministry of Education postgraduate studentships for research in theology.

⁸ Anyone who doubts this should read Professor R. B. Braithwaite's Eddington Memorial lecture, *An Empiricist's View of the Nature of Religious Experience*, Cambridge 1955. This admirably illustrates how far apart are the conventional theologian and the modern philosopher.

⁹ v. W. E. Hocking, *Science and the Idea of God*, North Carolina, 1944, pp. 27ff., for a telling statement of the modern usurpation of the priestly cure of souls by scientific psychology. These two approaches are bound to remain in opposition as long as practical theology remains outside the universities and so unable to contribute to research into human problems.

THE MAGDALENE EVANGELICALS

J. D. WALSH

Apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto. The familiar Virgilian tag often sprang to mind when the eighteenth-century Evangelical clergy gloomily contemplated their position in the Church of England. Until the very end of the century the Evangelicals felt themselves a small, insignificant platoon in the clerical ranks, desperately isolated from the hierarchy. Their evangelistic success seemed to bear little relation to their numerical weakness and their lack of influence among their colleagues of the cloth. In 1772 John Newton told Lord Dartmouth pessimistically "it is possible to travel more than a hundred miles upon a line in several parts of this kingdom and not come within ten or perhaps twenty miles of a parish on either hand that has the blessing of a stated parochial ministry".¹ Yet meanwhile Dissent and Methodism swelled year by year, especially during the eighties and the nineties when it was one of the most lurid of the many alarming social changes visibly taking place. Ironically, the transformation of English Nonconformity from the slumbrous Dissenting Interest of 1750 to the belligerent force of 1800, already talking audibly of Disestablishment, was often the legacy of preaching by clergymen who prided themselves on their devotion to the Church of England. Anaemic Dissent had received a valuable blood transfusion not only from Methodism but from Anglican Evangelicalism. In part it had been the result of what Canon Charles Smyth has conveniently labelled the problem of Continuity.² Time and again a popular Gospel minister had arrived in a "dark" parish, had awakened and converted it, and formed a devoted congregation: then he died or removed, was replaced by a "carnal" minister who drove the faithful to Dissent, at first hesitant, then confirmed. But there was a similar problem, scarcely less acute, which one might call the problem of the Eloquent Convert. The Evangelical clergy found themselves providing not only the flocks but the pastors for many Dissenting congregations. For they had to watch continually the heart-breaking spectacle of their abler converts with a real ministerial vocation yet too poor and unlettered to

qualify for Holy Orders lured—often reluctantly—to ministry among the Dissenters. In this way Nonconformity had gained ministerial recruits on a scale far larger than has been realized. Of Venn's Huddersfield converts, for example, thirteen were reckoned to have become Dissenting ministers; Grimshaw counted five from his own flock within his life-time; Jones of Creaton lost seven.³ There were many others.

What could be done? One answer to the problem of Continuity lay, as Canon Smyth has shown, in the patronage trust as it was used by Simeon and the Thorntons.⁴ But it could be finally solved only when the Evangelical party triumphed in the Church of England or had at least thoroughly leavened the Anglican lump. And that, John Newton believed, would not come about until sufficient "proper men be found or sought: men who love the truth and who dare to preach it. And since ordination is now scarcely attainable but by those who bring a college testimonial, let us earnestly pray the Lord to pour down his holy Spirit upon both our Universities, that a number and succession of such men may come forth to supply the places of those who are removed to a better world".⁵ The astonishing success of Thomas Haweis' brief ministry in Oxford had shown how much could be done among undergraduate ordinands, and had perceptibly quickened the pulse of the Evangelical movement through the whole country.⁶ The solution of the second problem too, that of the poor convert with the call to preach, could only properly be dealt with through university education. But how could an indigent convert be put through Oxford or Cambridge, paid and provided for? And where could you find a college at either University willing to take him? Oxford still contrived, in Gibbon's lapidary phrase, to "unite the opposite extremes of bigotry and indifference" and in 1768 had expelled the famous six "Methodists" for their indecorous zeal.⁷ Cambridge, more Whig, more rationalist and more tolerant, also showed strong prejudice against "Methodism", and John Venn (before his admission to Sidney Sussex) was refused admission at Trinity when it was known that his father was an Evangelical.

But in the seventies two special Providences changed the situation for the better. First, a society of Evangelical clergymen meeting at Elland in Yorkshire decided on 17 March 1777 "to set on foot . . . a fund for the purpose of educating poor pious young men for the ministry".⁸ This was an important date in the history of the

Evangelical party. The eventual success of the Elland venture led to the formation of several other Clerical Education Societies, Biddulph's in Bristol, Simeon's in London, Jones' at Creaton, and others, through which a great number of men were added to the ranks of Evangelicalism—and not a few saved from Dissent. The records of the Elland Society (still flourishing) survive, and give a full account of its operations. The income of the clerical education fund was drawn not only from the subscriptions of its members but also from those of other clergymen all over England, and from wealthy laymen like Lord Dartmouth, Henry Thornton, and Wilberforce (who characteristically made most of his subscriptions under assumed names to avoid notice).⁹ The fathers of the pensioners made appropriate contributions to the fund, and the pensioners themselves often paid back what they had been given. The income of the fund swelled from a mere £88. 10s. in its first year to £1,225. 19s. 6d. in 1796-7, after which it dropped to a steady £300 or £400 a year due to competition from the other Clerical Education Societies. Some of the pensioners were sons of Gospel clergymen—sometimes of Elland members—but most were of more humble beginnings, often as uncouth in appearance as in accent.¹⁰ The Society took great care in its choice of pensioners, and selected good churchmen not likely to be seduced into Enthusiasm, irregularity or Dissent. The preliminary examination of candidates was designed partly to keep out Methodists. Thomas Thomason was closely interrogated about “sudden impulses and sinless perfection” (two points where Anglican Evangelicals diverged sharply from John Wesley) and on his reasons for preferring the Establishment to Mr Wesley's connection.¹¹ In 1802 the Methodist preacher Joseph Benson submitted a plea for help for his son, studying for Anglican orders at Cambridge: it was unanimously resolved by the Society that this request “shou'd by no means be complied with”.¹² Before a candidate was accepted by the Society he had to have reached a certain educational standard, and even this was sufficient to discourage some like poor Billy Dawson (later a popular Methodist preacher) who buckled dutifully down to his Latin for awhile, but abandoned it when he feared it would “crack his brain”.¹³ Those who needed a good deal of polishing before they could be submitted to a Cambridge or Oxford college were sent off to be groomed at the homes of friends of the Society. Joseph Milner, Master of Hull Grammar School, took some; others were despatched to the learned

Samuel Clarke at Chesham Bois (described optimistically by Romaine as "the Solomon of our age"); others went to Samuel Knight at Halifax, Samuel Stones at Rawdon, and to the intimidating Hammond Roberson at Liversedge. There they learned their Latin and Greek, and those under Milner and Clarke got a grounding in Hebrew, an unusual accomplishment for an intending undergraduate.¹⁴

But having got its young men to this standard, where could the Society find a college willing to take them? Here came the second special Providence. At the time of the foundation of the clerical education fund a small Cambridge college, Magdalene, had fallen under the rule of three able and "serious" young Northcountrymen—two of them well known to members of the Society. These were Samuel Hey (9th Wrangler in 1771), William Farish (Senior Wrangler in 1778) and Henry Jowett (6th Senior Optime in 1778). Hey and Jowett came from Evangelical families in Leeds.¹⁵ Their election to Fellowships coincided with the Mastership of Barton Wallop, a young man who was known as a hard drinker, and whose main interests were "horses, dogs, sporting and horse-races". Save for a few months as Vice-Chancellor—and his election to that office alarmed not only the Senate but also the Archbishop of Canterbury—he seems to have been continually non-resident until his death in 1781.¹⁶ In Wallop's absence Hey became President (vice-Master) and the virtual head of the College. When there was only a handful of Evangelicals in the whole University, the presence of no less than three on a single High Table must have seemed a portent to parents and guardians anxious to shield undergraduate dependents from the notorious vices of university life. The Elland Society was quick to seize its opportunity. The first Elland pensioner arrived at Magdalene in 1778 (the year Hey became President), and in 1782 George Burnet the Secretary of the Society was explaining to Lord Dartmouth how pensioners "have hitherto been sent without exception to Cambridge, where Mr. S. Hey of Magdalen has exceedingly befriended them; and the tutors Farish and Jowett are both serious men . . . We have not any rule against sending them to Oxford, but the advantage they have at Cambridge has prevailed in its favour."¹⁷ Wealthier Evangelical parents followed suit. In 1783 Simeon told John Venn "Your father and Mr. Barram have been at Cambridge to enter Mr. B's son at Magdalen College; he is to be a Fellow-Commoner in order to have the benefit of Jowett's and Farish's

acquaintance".¹⁸ Soon Magdalene had the reputation in Gospel circles of being "the general resort of young men seriously impressed with a sense of religion".¹⁹ The number of Elland pensioners to Cambridge increased, and for two decades the majority of them came to Magdalene. The high-water mark of Evangelicalism in the College came in 1796-7 when there were no fewer than 12 Elland pensioners in residence, as well as other Evangelical undergraduates. The academic standard of the College went up rapidly, and Magdalene showed a corporate homogeneity which reflected the piety, discipline, and industry of the triumvirate which governed it. The Class Lists and University prize lists showed to an interested University that "Methodism" was compatible with academic distinction, and not merely the creed of unlettered peasants and artisans. Appropriately it was in theology that the talents of Magdalene men proved outstanding. In the first 23 years of the Norrisian Prize for Divinity, for example, it was won fifteen times by Magdalene men, twelve times by Elland pensioners.²⁰ The examining chaplain to the Bishop of Ely told two Magdalene ordinands "I generally find men of your College (Magdalen) better informed in divinity than most others": (a compliment not altogether appreciated in this instance, since the two Evangelicals found themselves undergoing an examination far more gruelling than that of their colleagues).²¹

This was very largely the work of Samuel Hey, whose rôle in the foundation of the Evangelical tradition in Cambridge has never been appreciated. Charles Simeon's enormous contribution to his party has been brilliantly analysed by Charles Smyth. But the fact remains to be underlined, that Magdalene was a firm bastion of Evangelicalism—the only one in either University—when Simeon was still at Eton. Simeon's first friends and disciples came from Magdalene. "Forty years ago," he told one of his Conversation Parties long afterwards, "I had none but Magdalen men at my parties. I hope religion in that College may be like leprosy in a house—impossible to be got out again without pulling it all to pieces".²² Hey's groundwork at Magdalene was described in 1795 by an *alumnus*. "In this College discipline had been much neglected when the learned and reverend Samuel Hey was appointed tutor: he immediately began by enforcing a proper degree of attention to study, regularity in attendance on lectures, chapel, etc., by which means the odious term *quiz* (which was first applied to persons of slovenly habit and

unpleasant address and deportment) was fixed on every one of our society: but to the credit of our tutors be it added, no college, in proportion to its number of pupils, has since that epoch sent out so many men who have distinguished themselves in the University".²³ Jowett too had some share in this achievement, and was conscious of the Providence which had placed him in a position where he could wield such influence for the Gospel: he hesitated at one time to marry lest he fly in the face of Providence and by his removal from Cambridge hand his tutorship over to a "person not serious".²⁴ A rude shock was given to the Evangelical triumvirate when Barton Wallop died in 1781 and was replaced by a Master who not only had every intention of residing, but was also polar to the Evangelicals in his theological views, and described by Henry Venn (with some justification) as "a most active and daring follower of Socinus".²⁵ This was Peter Peckard, an exponent of Rational Christianity, a friend of Archdeacon Blackburne and the Feathers Tavern Petitioners, and a disbeliever in Original Sin and the doctrine of the Trinity.²⁶ "The origin, the tendency, the end of Christianity is benevolence" said Peckard: his President and tutors would have insisted that it was the salvation of souls. The new Master discovered with alarm how the magisterial prerogatives had been usurped by the President during Wallops's absence, and he was compelled to assert his rights, which he did swiftly and with dignity and courtesy, but his Latitudinarianism fortunately proved broad enough to comprehend even Evangelical Moderate Calvinism. He showed no ill-will and no inclination to stop Hey's policy of packing Magdalene with indigent but hard-working Evangelicals. In the preface to a sermon printed in 1784 Peckard went out of his way to pay Hey a graceful compliment for his work for the reputation of the College. The dedication was "a grateful acknowledgement of your merit in superintending the discipline of our Society". "So long as I remain with you," Peckard continued, "I shall be happy to co-operate with your endeavours in the care of the young men entrusted to us, whose parents wish for a virtuous rather than a fashionable education".²⁷

But a disposition to unusual piety and a capacity for very hard work are seldom qualities that endear the undergraduate to the majority of his colleagues. Inevitably the "sober Maudlins" met with a good deal of ridicule. One "most ferocious spirit", encountered in Cambridge by a correspondent of the *Gentleman's*

Magazine, "solemnly declared that he was resolved to cut every man of Magdalen College, concluding with an oath that they were a parcel of *rippish quizzes*".²⁸ For the most part ridicule took the form of heavy jokes about the preference of members of the College for tea over any more virile beverage. The Maudlin men, we are told were at one time so famous for tea-drinking "that the Cam, which licks the very walls of the College, is said to have been absolutely rendered unnavigable with tea-leaves".²⁹ In memory at least, this peculiarity lingered on at least until 1828 when the first College boat was christened the Tea Kettle.³⁰ But sometimes dislike of Magdalene piety had less jovial consequences. One of Thomason's friends was refused ordination merely because he came from Magdalene: against his conduct "nothing could be alleged except that he was enrolled in Magdalen", and though Peckard warmly took up his case, nothing could be done for him.³¹ Thomason himself, a man of great saintliness and one of the best mathematicians of his year, had trouble at Ely in his ordination examination, and Thomas Rogers, terrified at the prospect of his own impending interrogation, may perhaps be forgiven for suspecting the hand of Providence in the death of the Bishop of Ely's hostile examining chaplain a few hours before the examination.³² There was even suspicion that partiality extended to the University examiners. Samuel Settle, depressed by his low place in the Tripos lists of 1798 wrote "a great deal of unfairness and unjust conduct has been shown to Magdalen college . . . a Maudlin man stands but a chance in the Senate House"³³ This was unlikely: indeed, when Isaac Milner of Queens' was examining, he was believed to show a preference for men from his own College or from Magdalene.³⁴

A number of sources give a good idea of the tenor of life among the Magdalene Evangelicals. It was not a life of leisure and luxury: Evangelical ethics and Elland economy saw to that. The pensioners had to sign a declaration testifying that they would submit themselves to the order of the clerical guardians set over them at the University in all things consistent with the regulations of their College and their duty to God. They undertook during the vacations to attend none but Anglican places of worship. When their university courses were over and they were ordained, they were not allowed to take a curacy without the leave of the Society. Their expenditure was rigidly circumscribed, and the Society ruled "they shall not employ a barber, supposing they do not wear a wig, or

hairdresser except during sickness or when their hair requires cutting . . . Their dress shall be plain and modest as to the fashion . . . They shall not wear any silk or anything deem'd extravagant by their guardians, though given to them by their parents or friends . . . They shall not purchase books, apparel or furniture without the approbation of their guardians from whom they will receive all the money they are to expend".³⁵ Each pensioner was placed under a guardian—a Senior member of the University, generally in his own college—who reported to the Society on his academic and spiritual progress, and relayed back the reprimand or (less frequently) the praise of the Society. Thus Samuel Knight, a former pensioner of the Society, now a Fellow of Magdalene, reported on George Barrs "Exceedingly serious and diligent—makes a good progress and wou'd do much more work than his Tutor cou'd find time to overlook—as to religion rather at a low ebb—in danger from literary pride, but considered upon the whole as a . . . rather good young man". Occasionally a pensioner had to be dismissed. There was Amos Simon Cottle whose bashfulness and diffidence worried the Society, and whose sudden production of a romantic poem on the Malvern Hills alarmed them. Finally he was taken off the Society's books for extravagance. There was W. H. Deverel who found his lowly station irksome and was dismissed in 1798 "he having put on a Fellow Commoner's gown, and given at different times much uneasiness to the Society".³⁶ But despite their disciplined life, the Magdalene Evangelicals seem to have enjoyed their years at the University. In the memoirs of Charles Jerram we have a pleasant picture of the daily round of three friends (all Elland men) who lived in contiguous rooms over the Pepys Library. They rose at 5, one of them would light the fire in his rooms, and there they would all sit, reading together. "Our terms of intimacy were so familiar", wrote Jerram, "we were constantly in the habit of using each others rooms, books, or whatever either of us wanted that the other had, without the least ceremony. Pleasanter days than these I never spent: they remind me of that happy state when the first Christians had all things common, parted their goods as each of them had need, and continued daily with one accord eating their bread with gladness and singleness of heart and praising God". Together they would break off to pray and read the Scriptures, and (says Jerram) "now and then when we could do it without the risk of drawing upon us invidious notice, we heightened our social

pleasures by singing our favourite psalms and hymns. Mr Thomason was but a bad singer, but delighted exceedingly in the performance, and was always the first to propose it". These spiritual exercises proved valuable in counteracting "the chilling effect of abstract studies and the un-Christian tendency of Pagan literature and profane mythology".³⁷ Yet, as the curious unpublished diary of Romaine Hervey reveals, life among the Elland pensioners did not always hold this key of quiet spirituality. Wilberforce once remarked in Parliament that "a religious man might sometimes be facetious", and "even the irreligious did not of necessity escape being dull".³⁸ Hervey's diary shows that some Magdalene Evangelicals were capable of behaviour as regrettably human as that of their unregenerate neighbours. These entries are typical:

1796. 13 Dec. Elegant supper with Batley who came down from London. After supper went up to Hogg and left my door open, and Batley and Settle came in to row me by making a most horrid noise, which alarmed Farish, who came up and found them in my bedroom by the help of a piece of lighted paper. Batley and Settle in a dreadful funk.

1797. March 25. Played at draughts with Cottle who got sick smoking tobacco. Nov. 6. Evening went to see the squibs and rockets in the market place. Batley brought home serpents and fired them in Barrs' room which burnt Barrs' face most dangerously. Nov. 18. Green attempting to pull Dornford's nose in Hall had a scuffle with him.

1798. March 19. Supped with Paine where Hartley and Porter quarreled. The challenge was given but made up. As I went away Paine threw a mug of ale downstairs after me, as they had done a bason of water on Barrs and Foster before. March 20. Paine came to apologise for last night's behaviour. May 10. Supped with a large party at Gilmore's, sung and romped till 12 o'clock, when Farish who was on the look out chased (me) to my room. May 16. Supped with Hartley of Trinity, made horrible noise with post horns etc.

In summer, Hervey and his friends found recreation in swimming by Queens' bridge, or fishing, usually "to no purpose": in winter they skated on the river at Chesterton or played shuttle-cock and battledore in the College Hall, or patronized the Magdalene House of Commons—a debating society which seems to have flourished when Thomason presided as His Majesty—where they considered a variety of motions from the question of the Slave Trade to a

proposal to put a tax on cats. Fireworks, posthorns, basins of water, facetious debating societies—these, it seems, are unchanging and perennial symbols of undergraduate private life: it is refreshing to see them even among the elect. Hervey's diary gives a valuable corrective to the portraits of unyielding sanctity provided by the shelves of Evangelical biographies, obituary sermons and spiritual correspondence. Even Farish had his moments of levity: Hervey, perhaps to their mutual embarrassment, once caught him reading *Tristram Shandy*.³⁹

It is difficult to say precisely when Magdalene lost its hegemony as the main stronghold of Evangelicalism at the Universities. Queens', after Isaac Milner became President in 1788, gradually took precedence, and Elland pensioners began to be sent there and to St Edmund Hall, Oxford, where Isaac Crouch had become Vice-Principal in 1783.⁴⁰ Magdalene Evangelicalism was weakened by the departure of Hey in 1787, and perhaps by the elevation of Farish to two successive professorial chairs, that of Chemistry in 1794, and that of Natural and Experimental Philosophy in 1813.⁴¹ William Gretton who succeeded Peckard as Master in 1797 was no friend to "Methodism" and tried to discourage its propagation, though to little avail, for he complained to Gunning that he thought there must be something in the air of Magdalene that made men Methodists, "for", said he, "we have elected Fellows from Clare Hall, from Trinity and other Colleges, whom we have considered to be most anti-Methodistical, but in a short time they all became Methodists".⁴² The break probably became more obvious under the Mastership of George Neville Grenville (appointed in 1813 at the age of 24). In the Register of Admissions for 1819-1820 one sees the arrival of a group of wealthy Fellow-Commoners, some of them titled. In 1827 the decline from the golden age under Hey had gone a step further, for the author of *Alma Mater*, recalling the traditional aversion of Magdalene men to strong drink, admits that "the modern men of Maudlin fully attest by their copious libations, the immense strides they have made in civilisation".⁴³ By 1840, when F. H. Bowring was up at the University, the metamorphosis seems complete: "the chief fighting men were at Magdalene and Jesus . . . and their opponents were powerful bargees, with whom they often had a desperate fight, so that the bargees affectionately dubbed Magdalene 'our college'".⁴⁴

But in the meanwhile what had happened to the Magdalene Evangelicals who had gone down? Few rose high in the annals of church or state. The Grant brothers, Charles and Robert, were an exception: Charles was raised to the peerage as Lord Glenelg for his services as Colonial Secretary, Robert knighted as a Governor of Bombay.⁴⁵ Several of the clergy became distinguished pioneers of Anglican missionary enterprise; Thomas Thomason and David Brown as East India Company chaplains, George Nankivel in the West Indies, and most famous of all, the "Apostle of New Zealand", Samuel Marsden, who wrote from the convict settlement of Parramatta in New South Wales in 1796, "If the gentlemen of the Elland Society had done no more than been the means of planting the Gospel in this distant part of the known world, this noble action must redound to them with eternal honour".⁴⁶ But most of the Magdalene Evangelicals lived lives of comparative obscurity as English parochial clergymen. To some, no doubt, like Samuel Settle, his hopes and ambitions roused a little at Cambridge, the prospect of a life time's burial in a dull hamlet or a remote manufacturing town was at first depressing. "I have never given you much encouragement in offering yourself to the Ellanders", he told Billy Dawson, "I have gone the road—long and dreary, and without a flower to regale my senses; and I have found at the end of it poverty, contempt, and almost universal neglect".⁴⁷ This was a passing mood: Settle lived a long, peaceful, and useful life, and paid back his debt to the Society with gratitude. But if the early Elland pensioners left individually no great mark on the Church of England, corporately they played an important rôle in the extension of the Gospel. For these were the men—by 1800 no less than 56 pensioners had been assisted by the Society, and many others by the sister societies—who unobtrusively helped to lift the Evangelical party into its position as the most dynamic force within the Church of England in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Humble, dogged, with a powerful sense of their calling, standing socially nearer to the proletarian world than many of their colleagues, better equipped to compete with Dissent on its own ground, they helped to bring their Church into line with the changing social pattern of their age.

- ¹ Historical MSS. Commission: 15th Report, Appx. Pt 1. Dartmouth MSS. vol. 3, p. 200.
- ² C. Smyth, *Simeon And Church Order* (1940), pp. 246-250.
- ³ H. Venn (junior) *A Diary Of A Visit To Yorkshire In 1824* (Venn MSS. in the possession of the family of the late Dr J. A. Venn, formerly President of Queens' College, Cambridge); J. Newton, *Memoirs Of The Life Of The Late Rev. William Grimshaw* (1799) p. 101; J. Owen, *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Jones* (1851) pp. 197-8.
- ⁴ C. Smyth, *Simeon And Church Order*, pp. 246-7.
- ⁵ J. Newton, *Memoirs Of The Life Of The Late Rev. W. Grimshaw*, pp. 105-6.
- ⁶ See A. Skevington Wood, *Thomas Haweis* (1957).
- ⁷ E. Gibbon, *Autobiography And Correspondence* (1869 edn.), pp. 29-30; S. L. Ollard, *The Six Students of St. Edmund Expelled from the University of Oxford in 1768*; J. S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals At Oxford* (1953).
- ⁸ *Elland Society Rules*.
- ⁹ *Elland Society Account Books*; R. I. and S. Wilberforce, *The Life Of William Wilberforce* (1838), vol. 1, p. 255.
- ¹⁰ R. I. and S. Wilberforce, *The Life Of W. Wilberforce*, vol. 1, pp. 252, 256.
- ¹¹ J. Sargent, *The Life Of The Rev. Thomas Thomason* (1833) pp. 107-8; cf. J. Jerram, *Memoirs Of The Rev. Charles Jerram* (1855) pp. 17-18.
- ¹² *Elland Society Minutes* 22-23 April, 1802.
- ¹³ J. Everett, *Memoirs Of William Dawson* (1842), p. 73.
- ¹⁴ *Elland Society Minutes*; T. Hervey, *Life Of The Rev. Samuel Settle* (1881), p. 25; J. Sargent, *op. cit.*, p. 24.
- ¹⁵ E. Abbott and L. Campbell, *The Life And Letters Of Benjamin Jowett* (1897), vol. 1, pp. 2-8; J. Pearson, *The Life Of William Hey* (1822).
- ¹⁶ See D. A. Winstanley, *Unreformed Cambridge* (1935), p. 19, 340; *Magdalene College Masters Book*.
- ¹⁷ Historical MSS. Commission: 15th Report, Appx. Pt. 1. Dartmouth MSS., vol. 3, pp. 256-7.
- ¹⁸ MS. letter of C. Simeon to John Venn, May 19, 1783 (Venn MSS.).
- ¹⁹ J. King, *Memoir Of The Rev. Thomas Dykes* (prefixed to *Dykes' Sermons* 1849), p. 6.
- ²⁰ A. Wall, *The Ceremonies Observed In The Senate House Of The University Of Cambridge* (A New Edition By H. Gunning, 1828), pp. 399-402.
- ²¹ J. Jerram, *op. cit.*, p. 138.
- ²² A. W. Brown, *Recollections Of The Conversation Parties of the Rev. Charles Simeon* (1863), p. 191.
- ²³ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1795, pt. 1, pp. 129-30.
- ²⁴ Note in John Venn's papers, Venn MSS.
- ²⁵ MS. letter of H. Venn to Jane Venn, May 21, 1785. (Venn MSS.).
- ²⁶ See D.N.B. and Peckard's work *Subscription. Or Historical Extracts* (1776) which he wisely published anonymously, but which can be attributed to him on the strength of internal evidence and of a MS. note inside the copy in Magdalene College Library by Gretton, his successor as Master.

²⁷ P. Peckard, *Piety, Benevolence and Loyalty, recommended. A Sermon Preached Before The University of Cambridge, Jan. 30th, 1784, Dedication.*

²⁸ *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1794, pt. 2, p. 1085; the anonymous author of *Gradus Ad Cantabrigiam* (1803) gives two definitions of "quiz", "One who will not be shamed out of his virtue, nor laughed out of his innocency" and "one who affects the violence of singularity in all he does" (pp. 108-10).

²⁹ (J. M. F. Wright) *Alma Mater* (1827) vol. 2, pp. 201-2. This author lists the Colleges in what must be his order of preference, and puts Magdalene next to last. Emmanuel stands high on the list as the "gentleman-like College" for "gay men" (p. 183).

³⁰ E. K. Purnell, *Magdalene College* (1904), p. 180.

³¹ J. Sargent, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

³² J. Sargent, *op. cit.*, p. 74; C. Rogers, *Memoir Of Thomas Rogers* (1832), p. 17.

³³ T. Hervey, *Life Of The Rev. S. Settle*, pp. 56-57.

³⁴ H. Gunning, *Reminiscences Of The University, Town, And County of Cambridge* (2nd edn. 1855), vol. 1. p. 84.

³⁵ *Rules Of The Elland Society.*

³⁶ *Elland Society Minutes* *passim*.

³⁷ J. Sargent, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-9.

³⁸ R. I. and S. Wilberforce, *op. cit.*, vol. 2, p. 322

³⁹ Transcript from the Diary of Romaine Hervey, Jan. 14th, 1795—Feb. 19th, 1800. The transcript from Sept 29th 1795 to May 28th, 1797 is in Cambridge University Library: the whole is in the possession of Hervey's descendant, Mrs E. K. Randell of Camberley.

⁴⁰ G. Dyer, *The Privileges Of The University Of Cambridge* (1824) vol. 2 Supplement (Cambridge Fragments) p. 23; J. S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals At Oxford*, chapter 4.

⁴¹ For a long obituary of Farish see *The Christian Observer* for 1837.

⁴² H. Gunning, *Reminiscences*, vol. 1, p. 239.

⁴³ (J. M. F. Wright), *Alma Mater*, vol. 2, p. 202.

⁴⁴ D. A. Winstanley, *Early Victorian Cambridge* (1940), p. 418.

⁴⁵ The Grant brothers also achieved a more circumscribed fame for their poetic talents. Robert wrote one or two well-known hymns which included "O worship the King all glorious above"; Charles published in 1805 *A Poem On The Restoration Of Learning In The East; Which Obtained Mr Buchanan's Prize*. This may be recommended to admirers of that fine anthology of bad verse *The Stuffed Owl* (ed. D. B. Wyndham Lewis and C. Lee).

⁴⁶ See *Memorial Sketch Of The Rev. David Brown: With A Selection Of His Sermons* (1816); J. R. Elder, *The Letters And Journals of Samuel Marsden 1765-1838* (1932), p. 31.

⁴⁷ T. Hervey, *Life Of The Rev. S. Settle*, p. 63.

THE SCROLLS, THE LORD, AND THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

C. S. MANN

WHAT IS here offered is an attempt to meet the enquiry of the layman as to the light which the Scrolls from the Judaeian desert may throw on the New Testament and the primitive Church. It is hoped to show that there is much food for honest thought in the parallels which the material provides—but it is also hoped to demonstrate that there is a radical point of cleavage between the Scrolls and the New Testament, and a cleavage so radical that no amount of parallel will quite dispel the unique clause in the Creed—*under Pontius Pilate*. But first we have to examine the parallels as well as we may in the space of a single article, and this we hope to do by selecting the outstanding material, section by section, in the hope that by so doing there may be avoided any duplication or confusion.

Our Lord and the "Teacher of Righteousness." More trouble than enough has been caused by the attempts of scholars—and journalists—to make some kind of identification of the rather mysterious figure of the Teacher in the Scrolls. According to the dating preferred for the Scrolls, the figure of the Teacher can, within limits, be made to serve any manner of identification from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes to that of Herod the Great. But, in sober truth, remove the capital letters with which the whole study has been somewhat bedevilled since 1947, and we may be nearer the truth of the matter. For there is not much suggestion that what we are dealing with in the Scrolls was an historical person—indeed, the right-teacher (or teacher of righteousness) who appears in the *Commentary on Habakkuk* might much more plausibly be explained as the title of an office in the Qumran community than the title of one unique person. CDC, for example, tells us that God raised up such a teacher some twenty years after the beginning of the 390-year period of his wrath (calculated from the fall of Jerusalem under Nebuchadrezzar). The teacher here alluded to may

have reference to Ezra, "the priest, the scribe". Yet CDC 9. 29 can tell us that there will be forty years between the death of the teacher until the destruction of all who have taken the part of the "man of falsehood"—and here the reference can only be to a *future* teacher. It would appear that once we have disabused our minds of the fascination of capital letters, and regarded the figure in question as a "teacher of right" (or "right-teacher"), the way is open to be more guarded in the search for easy identifications. Quite one of the most irresponsible aberrations of journalist sensation has been the suggestion that the presence of a "Messiah" at a banquet had reference to a single Teacher of Righteousness, to be identified with Christ. Such suggestions overlook the quite plain fact that "messiah" in the Hebrew merely means "anointed one"—and may, probably does, in the context mean no more than an "anointed king". It is possible that there is allusion to a single historical teacher in 1 QH 2. 15 (*Commentary on Habakkuk*), but the fact that the teacher suffered indignity and persecution at the hands of a wicked priest is no ground whatever for thinking that here we have a reference to the crucifixion of the Lord. Yet the suggestion has been made—and often made in the popular press with the assurance of a definite result of scholarship—that what is here depicted is nothing less than the betrayal and Passion of the Lord. Once accept the hypothesis that the teacher of right, or "lawful teacher", is the name of a continuing office in the Qumran sect, and the way is open to discuss the whole matter dispassionately, until or unless some new evidence makes identification far more certain than it can be at this stage.

The Language of the New Testament. There is room here for far more confidence than has attended the rather unfortunate attempts to look for *personal* identifications in the Scrolls. A reading of the Qumran literature brings home at once the truth that it is no longer necessary to make long and tortuous pilgrimages through the pagan Greek literature for the vocabulary of the New Testament. This is particularly true of the Fourth Gospel, where opinion has ranged far and wide in an attempt to make the author of that Gospel a debtor to almost every manner of Greek thought-form, respectable and otherwise. But in the scriptures of the Dead Sea sect all the illuminating sharp contrasts of the Fourth Evangelist are seen to have had their background in a common stock of Jewish, Palestinian, vocabulary. All the familiar Johannine antitheses are in the Dead Sea scriptures: light and darkness (1 QS 3. 25) the spirit of

truth and the spirit of falsehood (1 QS 3. 18, 20, 24; CDC 7. 19); there, too, are the sons of light (1 QS 3. 24-25). The struggle which the Fourth Gospel represents as going on continually among men, the struggle between good and evil, is no mere dualism of two opposing forces in the cosmos, but is an ethical struggle in which the triumph of the truth is assured already through the flesh-taking of Jesus. In the Scrolls, the same language is used, and the same sharpness of conflict is present—but with a very important difference (which those who stress the similarities ought to notice). In the Johannine writings, the victory is here already, while in the Qumran scriptures it is everywhere spoken of as in the future—a future which God alone can declare. But if for the sectarians truth and falsehood are interchangeable with light and darkness, as they are with John, and if there is a striking use of the phrase “walking in the truth” both in 2 John 4 and in 1 QS 4. 6, it ought to be noted that there is a vast difference between what constitutes the doer of the truth in John and the doer of the truth among the sectaries. For the Evangelist, the only doer of the truth is the man with faith in Christ Jesus, while for the sectarian of Qumran the doer of the truth is he who has bent his neck to the yoke of the Qumran community. Yet it remains an impressive fact that here we have a vocabulary shared by the author of John and the Qumran sect, and it would appear to be stretching coincidence too far to hold that all this was accidental. What makes the difference is the person of Christ in the Fourth Gospel.

The Apostle Paul has at so many hands suffered the fate of the author of the Fourth Gospel—everywhere, probable and improbable, has been acclaimed as the *fons et origo* of his vocabulary; according to taste he is variously represented as the evil genius who transformed the simple teaching of the Lord into nascent catholicism or else as the greatest theological mind of the early Church. But recognize as we will the extent of Paul's debt to the language of the Stoics (albeit with nuances of his own), yet the obstinate fact has always remained that there is that about his language and his use of words which is not quite at home in the Greek background, nor yet entirely one with the rabbinic style which was his heritage from Judaism. Now, however, it would appear likely that in one direction at least we have a *tertium quid* from which to draw illumination on the Pauline vocabulary—and that at its most distinctive. Though there are passages in the

Qumran scriptures which use the word "flesh" in the familiar sense in which it is commonly misused now—to denote the specifically sexual sins and inclinations—there are passages which are far nearer to the Pauline use of the term. 1 QS 11. 9 speaks of "erring flesh" in the Pauline sense of man in his utter naturalness, his proneness to evil, his incapacity to raise himself by his own efforts. This is emphatically not a Greek view of the matter, and the more so since both for Paul and the sectarians the "fleshly" man—considered as mere hapless and helpless human—can here and now have fellowship with the sons of light. How far, and at what points, there was a Hellenization of the Jewish understanding of "flesh" in relation to man's weakness, and in relation to the Fall of man, are far too extensive questions for investigation here. But for Paul, as for the sectarians, there was no desire to seek salvation by an "escape" from the fettering bonds of flesh. Here, decisively, Paul spoke as a Jew—and so do the Scrolls. The Pauline emphasis on the "spirit" finds a very decided echo in the Scrolls. It can, as with Paul, mean man's disposition or man himself (1 QS 7. 18; 7. 23); with the sectarians, as with Paul, "spirit" is the origin of prophecy (1 QS 8. 14). The whole of 1 QS 3. 13—4. 26 is concerned with the "spirit" and with the signs of the spirit which are at the same time the signs of the End.

An article by K. G. Kuhn ¹ has drawn attention to the remarkable manner in which the Scrolls illustrate the Dominical exhortation: "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation" (Mark 14. 38). In one part of the Qumran manuscripts there is great preoccupation with the signs of the End, and with the trials and temptations which will beset the true believer in that time of the End (1 QS 3. 13—4. 26). It is clear that it is not God who sends the trial-period, and the true believer will not be involved in it to the extent of his annihilation (much as in the Lord's Prayer the believer is exhorted to pray that he may not be finally involved in the *peirasmós*). The situation of the believer in the Scrolls is that of a man who knows that he is committed to total war with all the forces which evil, and the sons of Belial, can unleash. Constant vigilance, constant prayer, are to be his spiritual weapons, and in the warfare the graciousness of God has set limits to the extent of the war. He who holds fast to his allegiance in the time of the trial can have no doubts as to the outcome. Here we are marching with well-known New Testament concepts, with man in his "fleshly", weak, and dependent state

helpless with "fleshly" weapons of endurance yet armed with the weapons of the "spirit". In much the same way, Paul tells us that with the fire of trial, the *peirasmós*, God will provide a way out. The author of 2 Pet. 2. 9 also assures us that God knows how to deliver the godly out of the *peirasmós*. A world constantly involved in the warfare of good and evil, forced to be the arena of the conflict which forges the purposes of God—here is a complex of ideas common to both the New Testament and the Qumran scriptures. In both there is the assurance of the shortening of the days for the sake of the elect, in both there is the promise that the elect will not be finally overthrown, in both the assurance that in despite of all appearance God is in control. In spite of all that has been written on the topic, the pattern of the eschatological hope of the Gospels is to the present time matter for debate.² Is there in the Gospels, on the lips of the Lord, a sense in which the Kingdom, the Warfare, is in the present moment, or does the Greek verb *engidzein* hold in its meaning the sense that although there are in the person and the mission of Jesus the beginnings of the signs of the End, yet the Consummation is, as yet, not present in all its fullness? These are questions too large to be entered upon here. But it must be said that apart from the understanding of *peirasmós* as the "birth-pangs of Messiah"—a commonplace of rabbinic literature and Messianic hope—what the Qumran Scrolls have given to us is yet another glimpse, and a very impressive one at that—of the thought-world in which the New Testament writers moved. Here with all its urgency is the notion of the signs of the Coming of the End, with all the concurrent need for preparation and awareness of that End. What, it may fairly be said, the Qumran scriptures lack, and what the New Testament proclamation supplies, is the supreme and compelling urgency of *engus* and *engidzein*. Man, in his natural fleshly state, is faced with a warfare the issue of which—by all fleshly lines of calculation—he is bound to fear. The Scrolls may furnish him with the assurance that there is a limit, that God will not allow the warfare finally to engulf him—but it is the New Testament which asserts that under Pontius Pilate the warfare is already won and Christ the decisive Victor. Here is difference indeed—for in the Qumran scriptures so far discovered there is no notion whatever that man shares in the victory by incorporation into the body of the Victor. Indeed, the Victor (in any New Testament sense of sharing in human flesh) is not here at all.

Thus far for any light which the Scrolls may throw on our understanding of the milieu in which the Christian faith was born. We have now to look slightly more closely at two other considerations, where the illuminations are perhaps even brighter—one of them in the Gospels, and concerned with the Lord and John the Baptist, the other with the primitive Church in Palestine.

2

A very well-known illustrated paper headed some photographs of the excavated site of Qumran with the question: "Where Christ and John the Baptist may have studied?" This is all very well as journalism—but it is precisely this kind of thing to which the untrained layman is exposed—and to which he demands of us an answer. What are we to say?

Certainly there is no proof that John was ever at Qumran—though if he was, there are many things about his ministry which are far more explicable than they otherwise are. We know from the Scrolls that there were many members of priestly families there (1 QS 6. 3; 1 QSa 2. 22; CDC 15. 5), and we also know that the sect made provision for the reception and training of the young (1 QSa 1. 4-18) in much the same way as Josephus tells us (Wars 2. 120) that the Essene communities recruited their members by donation. But by the time that John emerges into the full light of day in the Gospels, he is no member of a community, and had no thought of calling men into community—only by a perversity of scholarship would it be possible to associate him with a community. To the end he was an individual ascetic, rejecting the ways of civilization—in utter contrast to the Lord for whom he prepared the way. There are, however, some rather tenuous hints to be gained from the Scrolls as to the possible way in which John regarded his baptism of repentance.

In all four Gospels, there is stress on Isaiah 40. 3, and we must suppose that the stress came in the first instance from John himself. In 1 QS 8. 12-16 there is the same quotation, associated with the men who are to be made ready against the time when they have to prepare the way of the Lord. The sense of "When these men exist in Israel" (Gaster's translation) or, equally possibly, "when these things begin to happen in Israel" is far from clear. What is here offered is but a guess, for the same words occur again at 1 QS 8. 4 and 9. 3 in a definitely eschatological sense. The context *can* be

read as meaning that when the men who are to prepare the way are ready, they are to go to the desert, prepared for anything, even for the final War. Prepared, the men will go out to meet the dawning Messianic age. Was this the purpose of the perfecting of the community—to make ready men such as these? If it was, and if John was there as a young man, then it is at the least possible that he left the community of Qumran for the very reason that he knew that the Age of Messiah was far closer than his brethren were aware. He therefore goes *out* of the desert to prepare the way of the Lord.

The most distinctive feature of John's ministry was his baptism. But of what sort was it? In spite of Professor Rowley³ the evidence for Jewish proselyte baptism is far too late to be drawn upon as background for John—and there is not a shred of evidence that proselyte baptism was thought to be concerned with the remission of sin (which was the proper sphere of sacrifice). It is true that at Qumran, with its rejection of the temple and sacrificial worship, the ritual washings had taken the place of sacrifice. Even so, there is no trace in the sect of any idea of baptism as a once-for-all remission of sin. For that matter, there is no proof that John regarded his baptism as unrepeatable—that is a distinctively Christian conception. John's summons, however, was not to a community with a repetition of washings, but to a repentance against the age of the Coming One. It is here that the Christian rite draws upon the uniqueness of the Christ-Event, the utterly unrepeatable redemption-history, for the ground of its unique practice of once-for-all baptism. What is significant at Qumran is the character of entering the water as *initiation* (1 QS 5. 8, 13), as the moment when the neophyte made himself separate from the men of perversity (1 QS 6. 14) and identified himself with the community. Here it is to be noted that the initiate was both subject and object of the washing—for the Christian, he is object only. John's deliberate sending men back to their secular occupations, rather than gathering around himself an eschatological community, must have had an important part to play in concentrating attention on his rite of baptism as a unique event. As to the meaning of the rite, the sectarians have much to say of repentance as a prior condition of a man seeking initiation by water (1 QS 1. 24; cf. 5. 13) and go on to say that no mere external act will save a man in the time of trial to come. Their rite was administered to men already "of Israel"—quite unlike proselyte baptism in a later period. Again, there is a Messianic age looked for

and hoped for in the literature of the sectarians. Very significantly, the age is said to be one in which there will be baptism with "spirit and with fire" (1 QS 4. 20; 9. 10ff; cf. CDC 15. 4) and the spirit is said to be like "purifying water". Here in the Scrolls are the characteristics of the baptism of which John spoke—fire and judgement (1 QS 4. 13), the baptism for the abolition of evil (1 QS 4. 19) and for the renewal of all things (1 QS 4. 25).

All this has much bearing on the disputed interpretation of the immersion of the Lord by John. That it has been for centuries an occasion of much heart-searching on the part of the commentators, a glance at any full-scale commentary will declare. . . . While there is nothing in the New Testament to lead us to think that John's baptism in any way brought a man into association with a community for the redemption of Israel—however understood—there are some clues on the subject in the Qumran scriptures. In 1 QS 5. 5 one of the aims of the community is said to be to "extend remission" or "atonement" for all who have dedicated themselves, or, even more boldly in 1 QS 8. 6 "effect atonement" for the earth (cf. 1 QSa 1. 3). In 1 QS 9. 4 the members of the community "atone for the guilt of sinners". Here, then, is no repentance with the aim and object of escaping the coming trial, but a deliberate attempt to create a holy seed, a "remnant". Without stretching the evidence in any way, it may fairly be claimed that here we have at last a satisfactory account of the Lord's baptism by John. Again, the link between the Lord's immersion in Jordan and the redemptive suffering of the living-out of the Servant-vocation is assumed in the New Testament—but why did the Lord think of his baptism in terms of redemption through suffering? Here we may usefully look at 1 QS 8. 3, where the "presbyters" are to purge iniquity by "active performance of justice and passive submission to the trials of chastisement"—and in this very work they are to *embody* the community, as the Lord, beginning from the baptism which John preached, *embodied* the remnant of the true Israel. To the Messianic Day the Qumran community looked forward with intense longing, and to hasten its coming and its consummation, there was to be a nucleus of the community, which, duly prepared, would be the very epitome of the "Servant" ideal of Isaiah, elect and chosen for the work of expiation (Is. 43. 10; 53. 12). All this must sound very familiar to us with our New Testament ears—but we have to take very careful note of the New Testament emphasis. In the God-Man Christ Jesus,

the Remnant, the Elect, the new Israel, is said to be already perfectly accomplished. For the sectarians, there was to be a period of special preparation, looking to a day of baptism when God would, with the baptism, give also the Spirit (1 QS 9. 10; 1 QSa 2. 11; CDC 9. 10, 29; 15. 4; 18. 8). What is declared in the New Testament, and by the Lord himself in the Gospels, is that in him, proleptically, all this is here already, and in one Man, the beginning of the signs of the End are here. Now according to W. H. Brownlee,⁴ the sect *did* expect all this to come about through one man—but this does depend on Brownlee's suggested exegesis of 1 QS 4. 20-23, and upon Brownlee's translation of that passage. He suggests that the relevant words should be translated: ". . . at that time God will purify by his truth all the deeds of a man, and he will refine him more than all the sons of men." If the translation should stand, then we have here in the words of the sectarians a language-milieu which perfectly fits the Baptism-Servant motif of the dawn of the Lord's ministry. So far, in the material at hand at the time of writing, there is no suggestion on the part of the men of Qumran that they expected the gift of the Spirit to be given through the Coming One. But with what we have so far seen, there would be nothing at all improbable in John so understanding the situation. This would considerably clarify the estimates we are wont to make of the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel—or to speak more exactly, of the Baptist traditions embodied in that first chapter. The precise identity of the One who should come was hidden from John, but, as we have seen, he stands apart from the current hopes of the man on the shores of the Dead Sea by being aware that he who was to come was already waiting to be revealed. So John, impelled by the lessons which he may have learned in or through the Qumran community, goes to Jordan—there to await the revelation, and there to inaugurate the last things of preparation. He therefore baptizes with water, as the first-fruits and the anticipation of that Baptism with Spirit which was to be the sign of the Coming One.

3

We have now to turn to the primitive Church as that is depicted for us in the Acts of the Apostles. Here trouble awaits us very soon. What were the sources which Luke had at his disposal for the compilation of Acts? A glance at the Introduction of the latest commentary on the Acts will serve to demonstrate to the reader just

how complex the study is.⁵ Lately, a suggestion has been offered that there is embodied in Acts a Petrine tradition according to which Peter died in Jerusalem under Herod.⁶ It is commonly said, with especial reference to Luke's Gospel, that the author was writing for Gentiles, and that on that account alone he omits the controversies with the Pharisees. Whatever may be said of the "travel-diary" in Acts, it is clear that in that work Luke sees the beginning of the Church's mission through the eyes of the Jerusalem community—he can even represent Paul as acquiescing in the decisions of the Jerusalem Council. What can reasonably be said is that Luke, who all through his Gospel and the Acts has a very firm interest in the manifestations of the Spirit, embodied in the Acts the accounts of the Gentile missions at Antioch for the very reason that the converts there were showing signs of the Spirit.

It is quite clear from Luke that the Church was founded in Jerusalem on the experience of the Spirit—however that very difficult Pentecost-story is to be set alongside John 20. 19ff. 1 QS 4. 6, 21 holds that there is a spirit which cleanses and leads to the life of blessedness (cf. Acts 2. 38). The sect, as we have seen, had a water-baptism (1 QS 5. 10, 11, 13) and only those who were repentant, separated from the wicked, might have part or lot in that baptism. The rite was necessarily to be preceded by penitence. (Josephus tells us—*Antiquities* xviii. 5. 2, 116-118—that John's baptism was for the cleansing of the body, the soul being cleansed already through repentance.) There is, however, no suggestion whatever that among the members of the Qumran community the baptism which they practised manifested the Spirit—and Luke assumes all through Acts that the manifestation of Spirit was the invariable concomitant of baptism.

The Common Life of the Church. That there was some manner of communal living among the members of the Jerusalem church we know from Acts 2. 44f and 4. 34-7, but it is not at all clear how the practice began. What is of some interest for our purposes is that the Qumran scriptures provide penalties for those who, on joining the community, take to lying about their assets. It should be noticed that the emphasis in the sectarian documents is not upon poverty as such, but upon communal living. Luke, however, both in the Gospel and in Acts, is full of concern for the "poor"—the "pious poor" of the Old Testament. However the "poor" of Acts are to be explained (were they men who came to Jerusalem in expectation of

the immediate End, and had to be supported by the common Christian purse?), it is curious to find this experiment in communal living among the Jerusalem Christians not very far away from the exemplar of community living at Qumran.

The Government of the Church. 1 QS 8. 1 tells us that the community was to be ruled by an inner council of twelve laymen and three priests. In the earlier chapters of Acts it is the Twelve who are in charge of the affairs of the Church, while the final editor of Acts makes the responsibility that of apostles and elders. The motivation and meaning of the Matthias incident is not very clear, and the plea that the election was to provide a witness to the Resurrection is but in line with the general tenor of Acts and of Luke. What, if we have any right to judge from the evidence of the Scrolls, is much more likely is that the Twelve (and Matthias) are the rulers of the New Age of Messiah (cf. Matt. 19. 28—Luke 22. 9). There is, it should be said, no basis in tradition for any theory that Peter, James, and John were priests. What is a perpetual puzzle in Acts is the passing of the headship of the community from Peter to James, the Lord's brother.⁷ Here Qumran can provide us with no clues!

The Communal Meal. Whatever may be said of other parallels between Qumran and the New Testament, here there is a very decided break. With the love-feasts of Christians we are familiar from the first Corinthian epistle, and from the practice of the Jerusalem church in breaking bread "from house to house". But nowhere in the sectarian scriptures have we anything which remotely resembles the Eucharist in *doctrinal content*. A communal meal there certainly was, and there are precise rules governing its performance, but of any suggestion that it was the Messianic Banquet of the New Age, or that it was for the re-presenting of an atoning Death till the Lord come, there is no trace at all. Nor ought we to expect such traces. Here, it may be said briefly—for we must return to it—there is in the Qumran scriptures no shadow of a hint of any unique Redemption-Act accomplished through Messiah (or anyone else, for the matter of that). The community meal, with exclusion from it as a penalty, is more in line with the treatment of the community-table in the Rule of St Benedict—it is, with the sect as with the founder of western monachism, the secular expression of the unity in God on which the community is based.

The Sect and the Christians. Did any of the sectarians become Christians? In all probability we shall never know. But what lies behind the remark in Acts, that many of the priests were obedient to the faith? It is not at all easy to reconcile this with the proud and time-serving Sadducees as we see them in the later pages of the Old Testament, or in the Gospels. But we may be allowed to indulge the thought that there may have been many to whom the secularization of the priesthood under the Sadducees was a burden too heavy to be borne—men from the ranks of the country-dwelling priesthood, remote from the affairs of the capital, looking, as did the early Christians, for the restoration of the true Israel. Now it happens that CDC 4. 6ff. in referring to Ezek. 44. 15 says that the priests were men of discernment, who are “those of Israel who repented and who went forth out of the land of Judah”. This is not at all easy to interpret, though it is capable of bearing the meaning that they were loyal members of the old priesthood.

It would be tempting to think that in the “pillars” of the Church which Paul describes in Galatians we have a copy of the three priests who are to govern the sectarian community (1 QS 8. 1—9. 11), and that—at any rate for a time—the Jerusalem community was ruled in like manner. There is a hint of a tradition at John 1. 40 that Peter and Andrew were followers of the Baptist, and, in an article which I have not yet had the opportunity to read⁸ Sherman Johnson makes the suggestion that they may have been sectarians at one time.

Early Biblical Interpretation and the Sect. The Qumran sect gave much weight to Biblical exegesis, and we have many examples of their methods in this field. Isaiah 28. 16 is used at 1 QS 8. 7-8 with reference to the council of the community, and though the passage from Isaiah has no place in the story of the Church in Acts, yet the very varied use of the metaphor in 1 Peter may suggest that the thought was a common one, and common to both Qumran and to the early Christians. The peroration of the speech of Stephen in Acts may, as RVm suggests, be a reference back to Deut. 10. 16, but what is interesting for our present enquiry is that 1 QS 5. 5 speaks of the “uncircumcised longing and the stiff neck”. Amos 9. 11, with its reference to raising the tabernacle of David which is fallen, is held by the sectarians to be fulfilled in the foundation of their community (CDC 9. 4-9). Here, Stephen and the sectarians are one in

rejecting the Temple, and in regarding the tabernacle as the true institution of God in the Old Testament.

4

We must now attempt to gather together some of the strands of thought which have emerged in our very brief and cursory survey of the parallels which the Scrolls may afford us in our dealings with the New Testament age. A Scandinavian scholar, to whose work we must refer at the end, has suggested in a massive piece of research that the treatment of the Old Testament in the Gospel of St Matthew has very close affinity with the method of treatment employed by the Qumran sect.⁹ The Old Testament quotations in Matthew have been a puzzle, and an irritating puzzle, to commentators for many a long year, for they depend neither on the Septuagint nor the Massoretic text. Stendahl's thesis is that "in the formula quotations the biblical text is treated in somewhat the same way as in the DSH (Habakkuk Commentary of the sect) quotations, while the synoptic quotations and the rest of the quotations peculiar to Matthew are taken from the Greek text common to the church and the synagogue . . ." ¹⁰ There is much common "atmosphere" between Matthew and the Qumran scriptures: the same interest in the "appointed time" (cf. Matt. 8. 29 and 1 QS 4. 18-20), the same interest in the fulfilment of scripture, the same exhortations to perfection, and the same methods of dealing with the erring brother. But by far the most important link of atmosphere (for want of a better word) between the Gospel of St Matthew and the sectarians is the attitude which both would appear to take in respect of law-making. 1 QS 8. 9 speaks of making laws which will endure until the new age, and the author of Matthew is apparently aware of the importance of making a tradition. The Matthaean exception on divorce is probably, if not certainly, best read alongside the "binding and loosing" passage. Matthew 23. 8-10 reads curiously like the kind of thing which we would expect the man of Qumran to have written. There is much to be said in favour of the hypothesis that though Matthew represents a tradition which appears at first glance to be alien to that of the primitive Church in the Acts, the alienation is between Matthew and the Hellenist-Stephen tradition, and not necessarily between Matthew and the Jerusalem community.

Is it possible to be even more certain of some kind of kinship between the milieu of Qumran and that of the primitive Church? It has long been recognized that Christianity as we see it in the Acts

does not consort very easily with what we otherwise know of Judaism in the first century. There, the primitive Church as Luke depicts it cannot easily be imagined as springing either from Pharisaism with its popular appeal, or, for the matter of that, from the snobbery of the Sadducees. Search them how we will, the Gospels will not fit either category. And though we are better aware now than we were some fifty years ago of the extent of popular political movement in Palestine in the first century of our era, and though in addition we seem to have some proof that the early Palestinian Christian communities were more involved than we thought in those movements,¹¹ yet there is no trace discernible of that political revolutionary activity either in the Gospels or in the Acts. "Son of Man" may have had Messianic—even revolutionary—overtones in Galilee, but if it had, we shall look in vain in the New Testament for them. Nevertheless, the primitive Church was born of the womb of the old Israel. But what manner of manifestation of the old Israel? A highly interesting study by Professor Cullmann¹² propounds the thesis that there existed on the periphery of Judaism a sort of Jewish Gnosticism, and from that, Cullmann maintains, the early Church must be considered to have sprung. This, the present writer would hold, has much of significance to say for the very odd and differing traditions which Luke has succeeded in welding together in the Acts. There we have the Pauline tradition of a universalist mission of the Church, alongside the narrow Judaistic legalism of the Jerusalem community. Granted this, so very much of the New Testament takes on a new light altogether. Matthew, for example, the most "Jewish" of all the Gospels, has a saying of the Lord forbidding any setting foot in Samaritan territory; in John and in Acts there is a very favourable view taken of Samaria—and it has to be noted that in Acts the Jerusalem community is represented as being uncertain about the wisdom of the Samaritan venture until there had been a manifestation of the Spirit among the converts. It may well be, as Cullmann suggests,¹³ that the link between the sect of Qumran and the early Palestinian Church is to be found in that body of people known in the Acts (6. 1) as Hellenists (RVm). Now, whatever else the word may mean, it does not mean "Greek-speaking"—*Hellenistoi* at Acts 6. 1 no more means that, than *Hebraioi* in the same verse means "Hebrew-speaking". Paul is nowhere called a Hellenist, while Stephen is. They can hardly have been men of the Diaspora, and the most satisfactory explanation

would appear to be that of Cullmann, that the name was coined precisely to describe the "fringe-Judaism" to which allusion has been made. It was, in fact, probably the only word which could have been used of a body of men who "lived Greek" to such an extent as to embrace an esoteric manner of life, and (probably) esoteric doctrine as well. Standing outside the main stream of Jewish life, the Hellenists were concerned with their own very close fellowship, rejected the Temple and its worship—no wonder that current Judaism had difficulty in finding words for them. It is hardly surprising that we hear so little in the New Testament of the Hellenists—for the most part we are dependent on sources which see the Church through the eyes of the mission of the Twelve. But there are hints here and there, and particularly in the figure of Stephen. To his use of Scripture we have already called attention, but there belongs to him—and to the author of the Fourth Gospel—an interest in the Temple, and the rejection of it, which was seen when we studied it in connection with the Scrolls. The same interest, and the same rejection, occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews. (It is of some interest here to note that Apollos, who was "mighty in the Scriptures" was also said to have had connections with the Baptist—and the suggestion has more than once been offered that Apollos was the author of Hebrews.)

Cullmann¹⁴ has drawn attention to the rehabilitation of the Hellenists which he finds to be one of the characteristics of the Fourth Gospel. On the basis of John 4. 38, where it is said that "others" will begin the mission to Samaria, but that the apostles will "enter into" their labours, Professor Cullmann finds an exact analogy to the situation set forth in Acts 8.

This is by no means all. Why, when the persecution arose over Stephen, did Paul go hot-foot to Damascus? If hitherto this has been a rather mysterious venture, it need not now so remain. We may dismiss the oft-repeated suggestion that he went there because he thought that Peter was in hiding there—we are explicitly told that the Twelve were untouched. This gives us our point of departure. The Twelve were unharmed because they were of the Jerusalem church—and orthodox enough to be left alone. The Hellenists were another matter. Damascus, to Paul the Pharisee, was a home of Hellenism and sectarianism, a home of the Covenanters of Damascus (which we had thought to stand alone until the discoveries of Qumran) with their esoteric beliefs, practices, and—

above all—with their rejection of the whole Jerusalem system. It is at the least probable that the early Christians had some connections with the Damascus sect.

It is not the least of the achievements of Luke that he has succeeded so well in making into one the diverse accounts and traditions—of the Hellenists, of Paul, of Peter and the Twelve, and of the Jerusalem church. So much, now that the Scrolls are in our hands, is so much the clearer to us from the Acts, and from the Fourth Gospel. Perhaps the Jerusalem church modelled itself to some extent on the only model of a close-knit fellowship which was to hand, and then had to come to terms with the radicalism of the Hellenists. As for the Apostle Paul, though he respected the Jerusalem Church and Luke makes him quiescent in the face of its decisions, he would go his own way, and not for him the close-knit fellowship of a sect within Judaism. The Messianic Salvation-Act was for all men, if it was for anything at all. But by the time that Acts came to be written in its final form the church of Jerusalem had either ceased to count at all—or was no more. In any event, the labours of Paul wrote its death-sentence in letters of Greek. What we have in the New Testament are the shadowy hints of a state of affairs that had long since ceased to have relevance. But however Paul may have been indebted to Hellenists at one time and another, we can see how his conceptions of the freedom wherewith Christ had set men free were shaken by the sectarianism which among the Colossians taught men to make much of “observances”—the very observances on which the Qumran sect set so much store.

5

It is hoped that what has here very briefly been surveyed will be of some service to those who are without access to all the periodicals in which Qumran is now discussed in its bearings on the Christian Church. One matter remains ere we pass on to suggest one or two books which will aid the seeker after information.

The layman who reads the *Times Literary Supplement* will not have had his mind set at rest by an article which appeared on the back page of that weekly some time ago. Indeed, after reading it, he might have some grounds for thinking that the world of Christian scholarship was quite deliberately suppressing vital information from Qumran in the interests of the unique character of the Christian faith—that here there was a “Gospel” found at Qumran

which threatened the whole Christian proclamation of the Good News; that after all, there *were* other records of the early life of the church, other records of the Lord, which Christian scholars are anxious to hide from the world. In the article in question¹⁵ J. L. Teicher makes a series of assumptions, from a fragment of some twenty-nine lines of Hebrew text, which would be astonishing did we not know what can be, and has been, made of the Qumran texts since their appearance. He assumes without any argument that *Yeshu'a* in the texts must mean Jesus, though the text itself is concerned with Joshua (which of course is the Hebrew form of our Lord's name), and assumes too that what we have in the text is an example of the Joshua-Jesus typology which—he assures us—has no parallel outside of Christian literature. This is to assume far too much. Granted that the Christian Church would hardly fail to see the possibilities of such typology, it is being rather rash to contend that what we have in this fragment is something which the Qumran sect could not well have used with reference to their own community, and to its leaders. To pursue this any further would make this article into a book, but there is yet another contention of Teicher's to which some attention must be paid. His thesis in several articles¹⁶ is that there is definite evidence for the *Christian* origin of the Scrolls, especially in the fact that in the Isaiah Scroll the marginal signs—which are to be found alongside all the passages which Christians regard as Messianic—are to be interpreted as a Cross. And, therefore (says Teicher), the X-sign must stand for Jesus. This view has been recently heavily contested by Sonne.¹⁷ In a very trenchant piece of criticism he places the burden of proof squarely on Teicher, maintaining that he must prove beyond all doubt that the X-sign stands for *chi* and not *taw*, that X stands for *Christos*, and not for *chreston* or *character*, that *Christos* (if indeed that is what it is) means Jesus and not some other proclaimed or expected Messiah. Otherwise, Sonne concludes, "the testimony of the X-sign will hardly convince any serious scholar".

The charge of duplicity on the part of Christian scholars is a little harsh. There was brought to light in 1945 a whole codex of Gnostic writings, in Egypt. Now although for many years some have trumpeted the claim that in the Gnostic literature is to be found the distinctive Christian vocabulary of the New Testament, this codex is—at the time of writing—yet unpublished. And those who are responsible for it are hardly to be accused of having any marked

predisposition in favour of the Christian dispensation. But unpublished this precious codex is, and we are promised no date for the publication of its contents. The Jung Codex of Coptic Gnostic literature is now being published with notes and introduction by Rascher for the Jung Institute of Zurich. Meantime, any New Testament scholar worth his salt is anxiously and eagerly awaiting some kind of news of the rest. Teicher has little of which to complain.

It has escaped the attention of those who maintain a Christian origin for the Qumran scrolls that the scriptures of the Dead Sea sect contain no single hint—whatever may have been the case with respect to a common vocabulary on which the Christians drew—of any distinctive New Testament doctrine. There is much about sin, with no hint of anything approaching a final redemption from it; much is made of the two Messiahs, priestly and kingly, with no shadow of a thought that in one Man they have been combined; there is much of the signs of the End, much of eschatological hope, much of the kingdom, much of the Remnant, but no shade of a hint of a suggestion that the hope, the kingdom, is near, or that the Remnant was to be found in a God-Man. There is the Holy War, to which the sect held itself and its members to be committed, a Holy War which is in the here-and-now—but it would be a vain search to seek in the sectarian scriptures for any suggestion that in this arena of our blood and sweat the victory had already been won in a Messianic Victory through a unique Salvation-Act under the presidency of a local Roman official. Vocabulary in common there may be, and we have suggested that we can find much which may illumine the study of the early Jerusalem church and the Gentile mission, but any notion that God by an act of condescension became flesh is utterly absent. As for any idea that there ever was, *or could be*, a Messianic Salvation-Act which Christians would recognize as the atoning Sacrifice of Calvary—as for that, we search in vain in the Qumran scriptures for even a vague hint of it. A teacher of right, or lawful-teacher, may have been cruelly ill-used by men of perversity—but that has happened often here in the sphere of human affairs—and he may have been revered after his death; but the Scrolls are quite innocent of any theologizing of that death, or of the life either.

“*Sub Pontio Pilato*” was, and is, as the late Fr H. H. Kelly was so fond of reminding us, the one unique anchor-hold in the Apostles’

Creed. But we are not thereby entitled to dismiss the help which external evidence may give. "Let him who seeks to deal with the Christian faith in our generation employ every means at his disposal to understand what he is expounding, and every relevant discipline to expound it intelligently."¹⁸

¹ K. G. Kuhn, art. in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 49. 1952.

² Cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future*, Macmillan, 1954. *Ibid.*, *Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, Macmillan, 1957. See also R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, S.C.M., 1954, esp. sec. II.

³ H. H. Rowley, art. in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 1940. Against the views of Rowley, see J. A. T. Robinson, Baptism of John and the Qumran Community, *Harvard Theological Review*, 50. 3, July 1957. Cf. also T. M. Taylor, The Beginnings of Jewish Proselyte Baptism, *New Testament Studies*, II, 1956, and J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, Gembloux, 1935.

⁴ J. H. Brownlee, art. in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 135, October 1954, pp. 33-38. Cf. also by the same author: A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with pre-Christian Jewish sects, art. in *Biblical Archaeologist*, 13. 1950; John the Baptist in the Light of the Ancient Scrolls, art. in *Interpretation*, pp. 71-90, 9. 1955. With Brownlee's first article, cf. J-P. Audet, art. in *Revue Biblique*, 60. 1953 (*Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline*).

⁵ C. S. C. Williams, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, A. & C. Black, 1958.

⁶ W. M. Smaltz, Did Peter die in Jerusalem? art. in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 71. 1952. Cf. also chapter one of C. C. Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, 1941. See also D. F. Robinson, Where and when did St Peter die? art. in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 64. 1945.

⁷ St Chrysostom (*Homilies* 33. 1) held that the Simeon mentioned in Acts 15. 14 was the prophet of Luke 2. He is apparently quite clear that it was not Simon Peter. Cf. Fr E. R. Smothers, S.J., Chrysostom and Simeon, *Harvard Theological Review*, 46. 4. Even apart from this kind of interesting side-light on the Fathers, only special pleading can make the Simeon of Acts 15 anything more than a shadow of the Peter of the Gospels.

⁸ Sherman Johnson, art. in *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 66. 1954.

⁹ K. Stendahl, *The School of St Matthew*, Uppsala, 1954.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 195.

¹¹ Cf. S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, S.P.C.K., 1951. See especially pp. 88ff.

¹² O. Cullmann, art. in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 74. 1955, pp. 213ff.

¹³ *Ibid.*, op. cit.

¹⁴ O. Cullmann, *The Early Church*, S.C.M., 1956.

¹⁵ J. T. Teicher, art. "Dead Sea Fragment of an Apocryphal Gospel", *Times Literary Supplement*, 21 March, 1958.

¹⁶ Ibid., Material Evidence of the Christian Origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 3, 3; The Teaching of the Pre-Pauline Church in the Dead Sea Scrolls, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 3, 4 (concluded in the same journal 4, 1); with other contributions on the same theme in the issues 4, 2; 4, 3; and with an article on the Scrolls and the Johannine literature 4, 4, 1953.

¹⁷ I. Sonne, The X-Sign on the Isaiah Scroll, art. in *Vetus Testamentum*, 4, 1954.

¹⁸ H. M. Buck, art. Biblical Criticism and the Christian Faith, *Journal of Bible and Religion*, 24, 1, 1956.

There is a wealth of material on the Scrolls of Qumran, but the reader who wants to be able to find his (or her!) way through the mass of literature which now surrounds the subject cannot do better than begin with Professor Millar Burrows' *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Secker and Warburg, 1956). There is a very fine translation of the relevant material so far available by T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* (Secker and Warburg, 1957), while Professor Burrows has promised a new book on the latest material, and the book is said to be for publication this year. Meantime, the S.C.M. Press has performed a signal service by publishing a highly important collection of essays—two of which have been referred to in the article above—under the title *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. Stendahl). This book came to my hands too late to be taken account of here, but a very rapid glance at its pages would not lead me to withdraw anything which I have written, though there might be modifications to be made, or expansions to be considered. Those who wish to have some information in short compass on the Scrolls and the New Testament cannot do better than read Professor Rowley's *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, S.P.C.K., 1957. It is a short pamphlet, correcting many of the worst "popular" mistakes on this subject. A forthcoming book, by E. Simon, *St Stephen and the Hellenists* (Longmans), promises to deal with many of the questions which have here been raised concerning the Hellenist sects of Judaism.

FACT AND INTERPRETATION: HISTORY AND ESCHATOLOGY

LEONARD HODGSON

*[The following was delivered as a lecture at King's College, London,
at the invitation of Professor D. E. Nineham.]*

WHAT IS HISTORY? My aim in this lecture is, first, to show the fundamental importance of this question at the present stage in theological studies; secondly, to commend for your consideration a recently published attempt to answer it; and, thirdly, to indicate some implications of what I have been saying for a particular problem of New Testament exegesis and exposition.

I

To grasp the importance of this question about history we must look back and see what has happened to the idea of revelation during the past hundred years. Here let me say at once that a large number of theologians to-day seem to me not yet to have woken up to what has happened, and to be conducting their theological discussions in dreamland, a dreamland in which we shall continue to go running round in circles until we have re-examined not only God's methods and channels of revelation but the very nature of revelation itself.

Look back with me to the turn of the century, to the days of my Victorian boyhood when men were seriously disturbed by the thought that any statement of fact in the Bible might be disproved by historical or scientific enquiry. Why were they so disturbed?

It is easy now to poke fun at the thought that the truth of the Christian faith depends on the world having been created in six days precisely as described in *Genesis* I. Why was it ever thought to be so? Why did contemporary works of Christian apologetics attempt to deal with the problem by arguing that if in the Hebrew mind the word translated "day" may have meant an indefinite period of time,

the Genesis account could be reconciled with the scientifically discovered order of events?

The answer surely is that what was felt to be at stake was not the truth of this or that particular fact or set of facts, but the assurance of a divinely guaranteed revelation which was immune to the changes and chances of human discovery and criticism. From that day to this Christian theology has been schizophrenic, one side of its mind pursuing paths of scholarship by methods of textual, grammatical, literary, historical, doctrinal, and philosophical enquiry, the other seeking to recover the sense of assurance that had been given by reliance on the divinely given revelation. On the scholarship side, for example, we see *Formgeschichte* supervene upon the Streeter type of gospel criticism; then the arrival of exegesis based on typological or liturgical considerations. These studies aim at increasing accuracy in exegesis, that is to say in the discovery of what the documents were meant to mean in the minds of their writers and were taken to mean by those for whom they were first written.

As a matter of scholarship this is, of course, important. Examiners rightly expect students not only to know the text of their documents but also to show some knowledge of current exegesis, of how Rawlinson, Lightfoot, and Farrer read *St Mark*, how Hoskyns, Dodd, Lightfoot, and Barrett read *St John*, how Cross and Mitton read *Ephesians*, how Selwyn and Beare read *1 Peter*. All this, I repeat, is important as a matter of scholarship. My academic conscience, after many years as college tutor and university professor, makes me commend examiners who demand a high standard of accurate knowledge and intelligent discussion in this field as a necessary qualification for high honours in theology. But then up speaks the other side of my theological mind. This cannot be all that there is to it. This is just the same kind of knowledge as is required by examiners for honours in classics, history, philosophy, politics, English or foreign languages and literature, and other secular subjects. There must be something more, something in virtue of which we call our subject theology, as being the study of what in some distinctive way is a matter of divine revelation.

"In some distinctive way." Consciously or unconsciously, for half a century or more, we have been feeling around for an answer to the question "In what way?" What are we to put in the place of the pre-critical acceptance of the Bible as a divinely guaranteed

manual of information about matters too high for scrutiny by human reason? I have said a good deal about this in my Gifford Lectures, and will not go over that ground again now.¹ I will add one comment on the present situation.

I have mentioned a few commentaries on certain books of the New Testament, confining my list to a small number of those written in English. Add to these the many others from Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Germany, Scandinavia, and elsewhere. Here is the New Testament, one little corpus of twenty-seven comparatively short books. And here is this vast and growing library of commentaries, growing because in every generation there arise theologians who feel themselves called upon to add to the number. What do they think they are doing beyond increasing the material for exploitation by examiners and their victims?

I have a strong suspicion that to a large extent these efforts are unconsciously motivated by the notion that if only we could get back to what the inspired author had in mind, and meant his reader to understand by what he wrote, we should have reached the goal of our quest for what is to be for us the *vox Dei*. What has happened in the nineteenth and twentieth century history of theology is that we have substituted for the pre-critical acceptance of biblical statements as they stand a hypothetical acceptance of what the various biblical authors may ultimately be proved to have meant. We cling to the conviction that somewhere there is to be found a statement of revealed truth which is simply to be accepted as above and immune to criticism. With one side of our mind we continue to probe for it by methods of scholarly research. With the other, in spite of the fact that this scholarship does not stand still, that almost every day some scholar proposes some new line of exegesis, we pretend to ourselves that we have it in something called biblical theology. The Lady Theology, once called the Queen of the Sciences, is suffering from schizophrenia.

We shall never cure her so long as we cling to this notion that somewhere there is to be found a statement of truth which is to be regarded as immune to criticism, for this is the fathering upon God of the kind of revelation that we feel we would have given if we had been in his place. To quote from my Giffords:

"We walk by faith, not by sight." False theories of revelation spring from a refusal to be content with our creaturely status, an insistence that the only revelation worth having is one which gives us the kind

of knowledge open only to a spectator of all time and all existence. But it is not for us to dictate to our Creator. We must be content to see and think and speak as men of our own age and culture. The measure of our faith in Him is our willingness to walk by the light of the kind of revelation that He has thought fit to give us.²

That revelation is given primarily not in words but in deeds, in events which become revelatory to us as the Holy Spirit opens our eyes to see their significance as acts of God. He reveals himself in his creative activity, and all that we can learn of the nature of the universe by scientific research or otherwise is a channel through which he reveals himself in the manner of his creation. For us Christians the Bible bears witness to a series of events in the history of mankind in which he reveals himself in his redemptive activity.

Our grasping of the significance of these events inevitably involves verbal statement. We human beings are so made that we can only think in words, unuttered words they may be, spoken to ourselves without realizing that we are so doing, but words, nevertheless, and words which are coloured by the thought-forms and linguistic usage of our age and culture.

This is why it is important to distinguish between the substance of the revelation, the acts of God, and the accounts which are given of their occurrence and their significance. Here let me quote from what I have written before in criticism of the statement that "since all subsequent theologies stand as an interpretation of the original *kerygma*, it is by their faithfulness to the *kerygma* that they must be judged."

The mistake here is to identify the revelation itself, the *depositum fidei*, with some verbal expression of it. It would be more accurate to say that all subsequent theologies must be judged by their faithfulness to the revelation of God in Christ to which the primitive *kerygma* bore witness. . . .

Careful exegesis of the text, seeking to understand what it meant in the minds of its original writers and readers, must be the basis of all attempts at exposition or the formulation of doctrine. But then the further question has to be asked: "What must the truth have been if it appeared like this to men who thought like that?" St Peter saw it with the eyes of a Palestinian Jew who up to the Day of Pentecost had not, so far as we know, travelled further from Galilee than Jerusalem; St. Paul, a Pharisee who had been born a Roman citizen, after his schooling by Gamaliel had had a university education at Tarsus;

St. John (if Dr. Dodd is right) had a mind at home in the Hellenistic culture of Ephesus. If the truth about God's revelation be such that those men saw it and wrote of it like that, what must it be for us?³

The *depositum fidei*, the enduring element which persists through all the history of Christian doctrine, is given by what God has *done* in the history of this world. In this lies the firm foundation of our faith, unchanging and unchangeable because (as Aristotle reminds us in the words of an old Greek poet)⁴ even God cannot alter the fact that what has been done has been done. But the firmness of the foundation is not the same kind of firmness that we used to think we had, and we shall not be cured of our schizophrenia until we are cured of our subconscious hankering after what God has not thought fit to give us

2

Our Christian gospel is the proclamation of what God has done in Christ in the history of this world, of its significance for our knowledge of God and the conduct of our lives. This means that the truth of our gospel depends on the historical truth of the events which we proclaim as acts of God. Various current theological works give evidence of the resistance to the recognition of this truth in the theological mind.

In his survey of the history of catholic thought from Bossuet to Newman Dr Owen Chadwick shows us theologians haunted by the fear of having to build their faith on the shifting sands of historical probabilities, turning this way and that in the search for an impregnable rock, seeking it now in the dogmatic definitions of Councils, now in the authority of the Church, now in the infallibility of the Pope. Bultmann's existentialist theology carries on the tale: for the foundation of our faith the uncertainties of history can be transcended by reliance on the certainty of a present relationship between the soul and God. For Tillich "revealed truth lies in a dimension where it can neither be confirmed nor negated by historiography. . . . Although it is mediated primarily through historical events, (it) does not imply factual assertions, and it is therefore not exposed to critical analysis by historical research."⁵ There are passages in Professor Ramsey's book on *Religious Language* which seem to me to tend in the same direction. About half way through his *Mystery and Philosophy*, without explaining

what he means by it, Mr M. B. Foster introduces the idea of revelation as a kind of *deus ex machina* immune to historical criticism. All these illustrate the working of the assumption that somehow or other, somewhere or other, there must be a sub-stratum of revealed truth which is immune to human criticism.

The need to be rescued from the illusion that God must have given the kind of revelation we think he ought to have given has relevance to every field of human inquiry, to questions scientific, philosophical, moral and aesthetic as well as historical. It is with the historical that we are now concerned. Here we cannot have it both ways. We cannot both proclaim our gospel as the good news of what God in Christ has actually done in the history of this world of space and time and also claim that our account of his doings is immune to historical criticism.

I have been showing how we theologians are beset by the temptation to evade this question, to try to find some foundation for our faith which will save us from having to face it. I want now to express my indebtedness to Professor John McIntyre of Edinburgh for the help that is given in his book *The Christian Doctrine of History*. It may not be the last word on the subject; it is a pioneering work which is pioneering in the right direction, which has seen what is the question that must be faced and sets out to try to face it. In what follows I am pursuing a train of thought set in motion by the reading of this book.

What is history? We have passed beyond the notion, fairly widespread at one time, that we can keep apart so-called facts and their interpretation, that the task of the historian is first to establish, as a matter of scientific certainty, the bare facts and then to discuss their interpretation. We have come to see that the so-called fact and interpretation are far more closely, are inextricably intertwined. McIntyre defines history as "meaningful occurrence", and argues that, if an occurrence has a meaning, that meaning is as intrinsic an element in the objective fact as the occurrence in which it is embodied. But our capacity to perceive meanings is affected by the categories with which our minds are equipped for their understanding. It is not a matter of our imposing a subjective interpretation on objectively ascertained facts. The question is whether the categories with which we are working are such as to enable us rightly to appreciate objectively meaningful occurrences.

Look at it like this. Imagine yourself to be a materialist of a kind which flourished about the end of the last century, one who holds that the only reality is the sequence of events in the physico-chemical world to be understood by the scientific study of causes and effects. For you history will be the record of what is at bottom the operation of these causes, all human thoughts and feelings and aspirations and our illusory sense of freely willed activity being epiphenomena, sensations generated and thrown off in the ongoing process of physico-chemical causation.

Now imagine yourself to be a humanist. You bring in a second factor. Human thoughts, feelings, aspirations, and purposively willed actions have a reality of their own. History is the record of events which embody the interactions of two factors, the sequence of cause and effect in the physical world and the purposive activity of men and women.

Imagine, thirdly, that you are a theist, a believer in God. Now you have a third factor to take into account, God's providential control of the world to which he has given the dependableness of the casual order and the human power of purposive action. To grasp the meaning of any event in history, to know what it was as a matter of objective, historical fact, it must be seen as one in which these three factors intertwine and interact.

So, lastly, look out from the standpoint of a Christian. God is not only the Creator of the universe who has given us the dependableness of the physical world and our own freedom and exercises his providential control over it all. He is the God who has entered personally into our history and lived as man. If this be true, here is a fourth factor to be taken into account, a factor of such stupendous significance that it will affect our understanding of everything in space and time. Affect our understanding, do I say? That is only secondary. *If it be true* it will affect our understanding because it has affected the nature of that which we are seeking to understand. Our understanding will only be correct understanding in so far as we take into account this factor as itself objective matter of fact, as entering into and constituting the very stuff of history.

If the Christian gospel be true the events with which it is concerned are such that in our study of history we have to take into account both God's providential control of his creation and his living a human life at a particular time and place in the history of this world. This involves the consideration of questions to which it

is impossible for any human being to know the answers. Take, for example, some of those which arise out of belief in the resurrection of Christ. Because we believe the events of the first Good Friday and Easter Eve to have been the passing from earthly life of God incarnate we can accept as matters of history the disappearance of the earthly body and the finding of the empty tomb on Easter Day. But if we are asked to give a more detailed account, in terms of chemistry or physics, of what happened to the earthly body, or of the nature of the risen body, or of how we think the one became the other, then we have to be content to say that this is the kind of question to which no man knows the answer. We have to be content to be like the man born blind, whose inability to give an account of the process of his healing did not affect the historicity of the event in the history of his life to which he bore witness: "Whereas I was blind, now I see." Our inability to give an account of the process of transformation does not affect our faith that our risen Lord, he who holds in his hands the destinies of this world's history, who in our baptism incorporates us as members of his risen body, who in the sacrament of Holy Communion binds us more closely to himself as those in and through whom he wills to carry on his work in the world—he is the same Jesus Christ who walked by the sea of Galilee, who bade his disciples love God with all their heart and mind and soul and strength, who prayed in agony in the Garden of Gethsemane, who stood before Caiaphas and Pontius Pilate and died on the cross of Calvary.

But what right have we, then, to call such an event as Christ's resurrection, equally with his death, a matter of history? The one, we feel, the death, was straightforward matter of fact, the kind of fact that historians are accustomed to deal with. The resurrection, even if our belief about it be true, was a different kind of fact, not the kind of fact that historians are accustomed to deal with.

We are tempted to reply that of course it is not the kind of fact that historians are *accustomed* to deal with, asking how what is *ex hypothesi* a unique occurrence can be any sort of a kind at all? But this slick verbal *riposte* evades the real question. The point at issue is not the uniqueness of the gospel story. It is the question whether for an adequate understanding of history we do not need to take into account factors which ordinarily historians are accustomed to ignore. I believe that Professor McIntyre is right in maintaining that this is the position we should take up.

To take it up does not mean that we are to be exempt from having regard to the generally accepted canons of historical study. We hold that for a full understanding of historical events the materialist and humanist interpretations are inadequate; in our attempt to grasp what has occurred we have to read the evidence in relation to the creative and redemptive activity of God. The fact that these extra factors have to be taken into account does not justify any disregarding or twisting of the evidence in order to superimpose upon it the pattern of our faith. In a recent article in the *Journal of Theological Studies* Professor Nineham shows how the writing of history involves the confluence of two approaches, the "*a priori* argument about 'what *must* surely have happened,' " and the *a posteriori* argument from the empirical evidence concerning what did happen.⁶ The historian who starts from the *a priori* end will be a bad historian if he is lacking in respect for the evidence provided by his *a posteriori* colleague. The aim of both must be a genuine reconciliation of their respective contributions.

Thus the Christian historian, who studies the empirical evidence in the light of the categories provided by his Christian faith, is doing what all historians do. The particular nature of his categories does not render his conclusions any more immune to historical criticism than are those of the materialist or humanist historian. St Luke wrote his gospel that Theophilus might know the certainty concerning the things wherein he was instructed. If the content of the Christian gospel is the proclamation of what God has done in the history of this world, we must be content with a revelation that has the kind of certainty that God has thought fit to give us.

Why should we ask for more? Here on earth, says St Paul, we walk by faith, not by sight. This is the certainty which is proper to faith, the certainty relevant to events in which time and eternity meet as the eternal Son of God enters upon and lives his human life and passes from his earthly ministry in space and time. It is the certainty proper to a faith which is no blind obscurantist faith that shuts its eyes to the march of historical studies but to a faith firmly grounded in a reasoned understanding of the nature of history and, indeed, of all human knowledge.

3

The particular problem I want to discuss in the light of what I have been saying is one of those arising from what is sometimes

called the eschatological element in the New Testament. But first a word or two about the use of this term. I hope I have said enough to make it clear that I have no sympathy with those who use the word "eschatological" as a smother word which will enable them to evade facing historical criticism, who speak of the whole earthly ministry of Christ as an "eschatological event" as though this lifted it above the plane of historicity. To speak of the coming of Christ as *the* "eschatological event" means, when we think it out, a combination of two things. It means (i) that we see in him the fulfilment of what the Jews were looking for as the *eschaton* of their hopes, and (ii) that as this fulfilment it involved the entry into this world's history of elements only explicable in terms of God's creative and redemptive activity, elements which, as we have seen, raise questions to which no human being can know the answer. In so far as we believe such elements actually to have entered into this world's history we can only justify our recognition of what occurred as being their embodiment by submitting them to the most rigorous scrutiny of historical research.

That being said, the particular question I want to discuss is what we are to make of the New Testament teaching about the end of the world. It will help me to make clear what I have to say if I relate it to Mr J. A. T. Robinson's book *Jesus and His Coming*.

Mr Robinson's thesis, shorn of qualifications which he is too good a scholar to fail to make, may be summarized as follows. Our Lord did not himself predict that he would return on clouds of glory to final judgement either in the near future or at some more distant date. This is a doctrine which emerged during the New Testament period of church history and had been read back into our Lord's teaching by the time the gospels reached their present form. His own words about coming on clouds of glory referred to his vindication as Messiah, his coming to his throne at God's right hand. Mr Robinson marshalls evidence to show that this doctrine appears fully explicit in the later strata of original sources; those which reflect the minds of the earliest Christians are more in keeping with what Christ had actually predicted.

I want to suggest that the first thing we have to do is to disentangle and keep distinct the two questions: what our Lord actually taught and what the first Christians believed. I am not denying what we have learned from the form critics, that the gospels are primarily evidence for what was being taught in the

Church, and that we have to discover our Lord's own teaching through what they made of it. But I am sceptical of the assumption that the earlier the stratum the better the evidence either for what Christ taught or for what we ought to believe. Let me quote further from the passage in which I was criticizing the view that the primitive *kerygma* must be our standard for doctrinal teaching:

If at the time of his preaching St. Peter was not able to see in the revelation all that St. Paul and St. John came to see, that does not mean that he was entrusted with a purer form of the doctrine, and that we get closer to the *depositum fidei* by ignoring their insights. What the Holy Spirit opened the eyes of St. Paul and St. John to see was part of the revelation itself, just as much as what was preached by St. Peter.

Moreover, it seems to me extremely doubtful whether there ever was formulated any such earlier doctrine as Mr Robinson suggests on p. 128 of his book where he writes:

The question now is whether, prior to the introduction of 13. 26 Mark, or the community behind him, did not perhaps view the consummation of Jesus' work in closer accord with Jesus' own understanding of it. If it could be concluded that the Gospel as a whole was planned originally with that rather than the later conception as its climax, we should then have a much broader picture of the stage in the Church's thinking that lay behind the *Parousia* doctrine.

It is the attempt to trace a pattern of steady growth in the Church's thinking that seems to me doubtfully historical. There is no doubt that in the New Testament as we have it Mr Robinson's later doctrine is fully explicit. What had been one of the forms in which Jews looked for the first coming of Messiah has been postponed to be fulfilled in his return. I want to suggest the hypothesis that this was not the overlaying of an earlier by a later doctrine, but that there was no one earlier doctrine at all. The impression I get of the earliest Christians from the concluding chapters of the Gospels and the opening chapters of *Acts* is of a body of men who just did not know what to think. The Lord was risen and alive and among them. After the shock of the events of the previous few days this staggering fact struck them dumbfounded. Somehow or other it was true after all. He was the Messiah. They were "begotten again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead". What form that "lively hope" was to take had still to be sorted out.

They were asking questions like "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" There is nothing surprising in the fact that they came to give substance to the "lively hope" by looking to the future for the kind of coming of which they had been disappointed at the first advent of their Lord. There is no need to postulate that this must have been a later belief which took the place of an earlier. Nor need we think that unless there had been such an earlier we have no ground for discarding the later. If the result of a scholarly exegesis should be to show that the first Christians, in bearing witness to their recognition of Jesus as Messiah, pictured the fulfilment of his messiahship according to the expectations that possessed their minds, this exegesis provides the material for us to ask our question: what must the truth have been and be if men who thought as they did put it like that?

We come to the question of our Lord himself, of what he thought and taught. I am not going to call in question Mr Robinson's exegesis here. It is a scholarly and judicious piece of work; for its discussion in detail I must leave it to those better equipped than I am to engage in its study on *a posteriori* lines. My part is to urge that such study be set in the context of certain considerations that appear to me to be of importance.

First, the trend of Gospel study in the last half century suggests that we should be careful not to underrate the element of originality in our Lord's thinking and teaching. Whether he thought of himself as already Messiah, or as Messiah designate, it is surely clear that his idea of messiahship did not correspond to any of those to be found in existing schools of messianic expectation. By his contemporaries, whose minds were conditioned by their notions of what Messiah would be and do, he must often have been misunderstood, have been thought to be saying something other than what he meant, and this misunderstanding may have affected the form in which his words were remembered and reported. With regard to his idea of messiahship we have learned to beware of making the same mistake, of thinking that we can explain his thought by quoting parallels to show that he belonged to this or that contemporary school, or derived his convictions from their source in this or that Old Testament passage. However much he may have found guidance and inspiration in the study of Holy Writ, and used the language of current thought, there can be no doubt that the revolution he wrought in the idea of messiahship, the revolution for which he was

rejected as a blasphemous impostor and crucified, was his own. We must be prepared to find as much originality in his thought about the future destiny of Messiah as in that about his present vocation.

Secondly, I want to call attention to the significance of the inclusion of Simon the Zealot in the Twelve. It reminds us that apocalyptists were not the only school of thought in contemporary eschatology. Besides those who looked for the appearance of the Lord in the sky to bring to an end the present age with the advent of a new heaven and a new earth, there were those who looked for the raising up of an earthly ruler, a second David, who would rally God's people to arms, drive out the occupying power, establish the kingdom of God on earth and rule the nations of the world in God's name from its centre in the city which he had chosen to place his name there. We do not doubt that our Lord rejected this idea of his messianic destiny. We need not conclude that his only alternative was to accept that of the apocalyptists.

It may help us to grasp his situation if we reflect that to-day we are in similar case. On the one hand we have those who rest their hopes for the future on the possibility of human progress. They look for the coming of an earthly paradise to be achieved by increasing scientific control of the forces of nature and the spread of education. Their methods may be different from those advocated by the zealots, but their goal is essentially the same. On the other hand are those who despair of this world's future, who think of it as destined to be burnt up in the ever-lasting bonfire and pin their hopes on their expectation of the return of Christ in glory to judgement.

The zealots of our Lord's time differed from the humanists of to-day in that they believed in God, that their leader and his followers would be raised up and inspired from on high and fight and rule as the armies of the living God. Granted this difference, I have shown in my book on the Atonement that both kinds of expectation, both that which looks for the fulfilment of God's creative purpose in the history of this world and that which despairs of this world's perfection and looks for its catastrophic destruction, are to be found in the New Testament. Would this be so if the Lord had been known unmistakably to have committed himself to one or the other?

Further, let me quote my comments on sayings in which he is reported to have used the language of apocalyptic :

It is now generally agreed that in matters of science and history, on questions of empirical fact, our Lord during His earthly ministry, in His incarnate human mind, shared with His contemporaries in their knowledge. We find no difficulty in holding that so far as the details of past history are concerned He accepted what was commonly believed among His people at the time. I cannot see why we should adopt a different principle when what we are concerned with are the details of future history. There is ample evidence that the apocalyptic imagery He used was that which He took over from current Jewish thought in the same way as, no doubt, He took over the account of the creation of the world in six days. We have learned that we can hold fast to the truth of the world's creation by God and man's responsibility to his Creator while substituting for that account our evolutionary view of its historical origin. There is no disloyalty to our Lord in accepting on His authority the certainty of divine judgment while preserving an open mind on the question of the historical process whereby in the future the rescue of God's creation from its infection by evil shall be consummated.⁷

I have twice spoken of questions to which no human beings know the answers. If there be such a class, it must surely include some of those concerning the relation of time to eternity. No one since Kant can ignore the paradox of the impossibility of conceiving time and space either as limited or as without limits. We arrive at what is not the same but a similar *impasse* when we try to imagine what can conceivably be the *eschaton* and *telos* of this world's history, the fulfilment of God's creative and redemptive purpose for this world in space and time. I submit that we have no right to demand that we shall find in the teaching of Christ an answer to such questions, that to do so is to prescribe to God the kind of revelation we think he should have provided instead of being content to accept that which he has thought fit to give us.

My approach, you will have noticed, has been of the kind which Professor Nineham has called *a priori*. I leave it to you, who have to follow the *a posteriori* road in order to satisfy your examiners' just demand for exact scholarship, to investigate whether the evidence will support my reading of it. According to that reading Jesus found himself surrounded by differing messianic and eschatological expectations in which men thought to picture to themselves the shape of things to come, the actual course of future events in history. He was too wise to identify himself with any prediction which should profess to give in advance the kind of information

about questions of empirical fact for which men on earth must be content to wait and see. We shall not be cured of our theological schizophrenia until we cease from the delusion that somewhere within the pages of the Bible we must be able to find the kind of answers to questions which he was unwilling to give.

¹ *For Faith and Freedom*, Vol. I. Lecture IV; Vol. II. Lecture I.

² Vol. I, p. 89.

³ *For Faith and Freedom*, Vol. II, pp. 227-8.

⁴ *Eth. Nic.* 1139 b.

⁵ *Systematic Theology*, Vol. I, p. 144.

⁶ April 1958, pp. 14-16.

⁷ *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, p. 126.

THE THEOLOGICAL CHALLENGE OF "DOCTOR FAUSTUS"

ULRICH SIMON

THE IMPACT of the old story of Dr Faustus on Christian theology has never been slight and its popularity is perhaps not least due to its lingering Northern paganism and its offer of diabolic redemption. Goethe's Faust, for instance, became for many Germans, and even German-speaking Jews, almost a kind of Bible, for here the Gospel of the redemption of the eternally-striving was set forth with classical validity. Accordingly Mephistopheles, the civilized devil, who performs God's will by denial and accusation (as in Job), cannot prevent his victim's soul from reaching a Heaven whose traditional Catholic structure never fails to come as a surprise at the very end. In this way Goethe, perhaps unintentionally, reconciled the nineteenth century with its own contradictions of a Christian heritage and a pagan desire. His Faust became a symbol of the German character, or so at least some Germans fondly believed. But in the twentieth century the symbol was eliminated and Thomas Mann took it upon himself to replace the old with a new Dr Faustus; not a play but a novel, which is immensely entertaining and which glows with the author's usual irony. It is a book which theologians ought to ponder well, for it is even more relevant to their problems than that earlier mine of information and Biblical psychology, Mann's long Jacob-Joseph Saga.

In his Doctor Faustus Mann gives us the biography of a musician. Adrian Leverkühn, who dies insane in 1940. Mann uses the figure of a nice and somewhat pompous narrator, a Catholic teacher, by the name of Zeitblom, who writes in the retirement of a Bavarian village during the catastrophic closing years of the last war. By this technique Mann obtains some detachment from his hero and succeeds in weaving together the different decades of the present century. The horrors of the forties are ever-present; what Mann felt about the making of this work he has recorded in an invaluable sketch *Die Entstehung des Doktor Faustus*, where we can follow

him on his creative Odyssey, in California and elsewhere in the U.S.A., working, lecturing, recuperating from a serious illness, and always engaged in his war against the Nazis. Doktor Faustus is indubitably a product of the war, yet the hero Leverkühn cannot be regarded solely or even primarily as a victim of that particular Nazi demonology. Mann sees to it that he grows insane well before the Nazis' advent to power. Nor is Leverkühn simply a proto-type of Nazi, but rather a member of that select aristocracy of the spirit whose patron Nietzsche had become at the beginning of the century. There are some obvious and undisguised parallels: Leverkühn's innocent and yet fateful visit to a brothel, his obsessional sensitivity, his migraines, his loneliness, and his final mental collapse. The canvas of the novel is, however, not German only but universal, for it concerns the whole tragic problem of man's existence in the twentieth century, as experienced by a creative artist who happens also to be a theologian *manqué*.

Given this setting the universal problem may be stated in particular, namely musical, terms. There had once been a time when music served the accepted cultus. In the absence of an independent culture the whole social organism was united in its drama, its dancing, and its music, which was objective and liturgical, questioning neither its aims nor its techniques. In the eighteenth century the first signs of a totally different conception appear. Mozart, for example, struggles to free himself from episcopalian employment in Salzburg and when he fails to find imperial favour in Vienna he becomes, albeit unsuccessfully, a free-lance who must rely on Masonic support. Then secularization sets in everywhere, but the real watershed is reached with Beethoven. Music can never be the same again, for in him the irreversible has happened.

It would be stupid to denounce Beethoven's subjectivity or to deplore the fact that the great titan went outside, and thereby abolished, all accepted forms; that, for example, by writing his *Missa Solemnis* he really brought to an end one aspect of the Christian liturgical tradition. The matter goes much deeper and must not be allowed to be obscured by the temporary success of the romantics. From now on music can no longer be made in simplicity and no musician can address himself to his audience in unequivocal terms. Severed from its original unity music has become independent. What is its destiny, what should music *do*, in non-cultic isolation? Should it evoke nice feelings or entertain? More seriously still, what are

the forms it should use, seeing that Beethoven has brought all conventions into disrepute by fulfilling the same? Who, to put it plainly, can write a sonata after op. 111? The lecture of the stuttering music-teacher Kretzschmar must be read—it is a brilliant piece of writing—to understand what Mann means by finality, the full stop in music. Others may write symphonies after him, but why?

It is not our purpose to accompany Leverkühn on his musical pilgrimage, except to mention that his pact with the devil becomes a necessity in the general cultural impasse. His integrity is too intense to permit him to compromise with fashion or to write hack-music. He really is a master of composition who wields all the registers of technical *finesses*, but his genius must remain mute until he can serve a transcendental, liturgical, objective reality. He is, therefore, prepared to sacrifice himself to the diabolically inspiring force and cut himself off from all human affections. In exchange his art becomes truly new, and this newness is cosmic and apocalyptic, Faustian.

How different are the devil's gifts to his protégé of the twentieth century when compared with the warm, erotic advantages of rejuvenation, which Goethe's Mephisto bestows upon Faust! Leverkühn's devil is icy, impudent, real, and as he is so are his gifts. One thing he shares with Mephisto, it is true: he sells time, great, significant, diabolical time, but the resultant ecstasies and illuminations are transcendently cold. It is as if the whole *mysterium fascinans* of previous ages, the crazy enthusiasms of a credulous world, the excesses of miracle-workers and flagellant ascetics, now abolished or at least suppressed through all sorts of decencies, well up in a tremendous stream. Leverkühn's devil releases a new principle of metaphysical animation, but the experience of the infinite with its endless delights and pains, which he offers, differs essentially from the traditional mantic world. The old cosmic harmonies are replaced by a new cosmic polyphony which is essentially beyond human feeling, outside the categories of goodness, beauty, and love.

The relevance of the diabolical offer to the artistic sphere is obvious, but it may well be argued that theology remains unmoved inasmuch as the Queen of the sciences exists independently of aesthetic forms. Thus the problems of a post-Beethoven era cannot exist, if only because there never was a comparable figure to transform Christian theology beyond recall. But such an easy judgement

is apt to ignore the total cultural disorganization of our time. Clearly, if the question "What is music for?" may and must be asked, how much more pressing is the challenge: "What is theology for?" Theology discredits itself by working on the premise of the delusion that social stability and rational harmony still exist and create a sort of market for theological wares.

Thomas Mann grasps the juxtaposition of music and theology with uncanny precision: the problems of the two disciplines are closely related, because both have lost the unifying anchorage of accepted, objective liturgy. It is, therefore, integral to Mann's design that his hero Leverkühn on leaving school first goes to Halle to study theology at this ancient seat of the Lutheran tradition. Though abnormally reticent, Leverkühn manages to be quite happy at the university, does not fall out with the place on temperamental grounds, and gets along with his fellows (most of whom are doomed to die in the 1914-1918 war). The humorous normalcy of these early chapters enables Mann to get to the bottom of the theological bankruptcy of the early years of the century. Leverkühn has chosen the study of theology out of a sense of superiority, seeking for the universally and objectively true. But he cannot find at all what he wants: the lectures at the university bring before him the whole absurdity of his search, for theology has become, like music, an accommodation. Theology speaks like a bastard who wishes to ingratiate himself with all comers; this quasi-science seeks to "retain" as much as is possible from the inroads of real science. Past are the days of the fervour of the Reformation and of intense piety; instead sterile controversies about Schleiermacher's "sense of and taste for the eternal" and religious experience abound, since the Kantian critique has declared all *metaphysical* wrangling null and void: what, then, is to be "saved" from the wreckage of rational theology, and what may be legitimately jettisoned? Mann twists his rapier adroitly in the professors' circus of the faculty of theology: these clowns perform feats of absurdity in such fields as "the science of religion", as if theology could be "saved" by a few concessions here and there.

As the story unfolds it becomes increasingly clear that just as music is dominated in the last resort by the music-makers so theology is made by the theologians. In other words the issue is a personal one, for that strange confraternity of theological teachers at Halle is fundamentally concerned to defend not only its own

cultural ideal but its position in society and its economic standard of living, while the pupils, far more aware of contemporary social problems, seek an escape in the woods and fields. Only one lecturer, the *Privatdozent* Schleppfuss, a dangerous and nasty little man, whose name—the dragging foot—probably anticipates the future Dr Goebbels and the Satanism to come, approaches his subject from a different angle: for him the demonic in religion is the focal point of all theology. Much as we are meant to detest him we cannot help inferring that he is nearer the truth than his complacent colleagues, for evil will soon be the quintessence of theological concern.

In the past theologians could ignore the demonic chaos and even now they play about with a world of appearances, as if the universal Gospel of Love had not been decisively rejected and become stale news. But even if they would serve up the old wine in new bottles of better technique, higher scholarship, an elegant style, mass enthusiasms. etc., their failure to preserve rational religion in an irrational world of stupendous predicaments becomes only more evident and ridiculous. Schleppfuss' diabolical, neo-Faustian theme breaks with the institutions and intentions of the irrecoverable past and looks forward to a new transcendentalism, which puts demonic possession within reach of a newly integrated society. Outside moral considerations, beyond human feelings, lies the inspired, icy, cosmic, scientific truth, the new religion with its new liturgy.

This Faustian diabolism is more frightening than Orwell's terrifying pattern of the future which is, after all, still of the earth and social. The transcendental demonism reverses the Christian ideal of humanity and abolishes the Christian buttresses of reason and emotional satisfaction. The Christian tradition has always viewed human existence as a reflexion of the eternal order and human activity as a sacramental expression of the work of God. Whereas Communism opposes the Christian tradition by abolishing all transcendental values and criteria the Faustian diabolism accepts the ancient tradition, but its new world corresponds not to the perfect creation of the Creator but rather to the chaos which encompasses the whole world. God is not only dead, but his place has been usurped by the devil and his legions. Man has projected his sin into the spiritual world and an inspired horror rules everywhere. It is as if Dante's Hell had swallowed up Purgatory and Heaven in a supreme victory of hatred over love.

Is Mann's story of temptation, assent, and fall to be dismissed from serious consideration because it is a tale of disintegration and madness and because the hero pays for inspiration with utter loss and darkness? If traditional Christian orthodoxy or liberal heterodoxy had been successful in preserving the sanity of the Western world—if Auschwitz, Hiroshima, and inter-continental missiles had never existed as the most patent demonstrations of diabolical power—one might be inclined to brush off the Faust-motif as irrelevantly unpleasant. But since unfortunately the apocalyptic reality is the constant in a changing world it is futile to give an "answer to Job" which by-passes the one really important issue, raised so signally by the Faust demonism.

One of the composer's achievements is most appropriately his *Apocalypsis cum figuris* in which, under the onrush of tremendous inspiration, he recasts and reunites all the old strands of Apocalyptic culture. In this work the "theological virus" has obtained possession to the same extent as in the visions and experiences of St John on Patmos, of Dante in exile, of Dürer and Blake. But now the music is permeated not with romantic themes, nor with motifs of redemption, but with the theological negative: *the total absence of Grace*, for the artist heralds the advent of the new world, the collapse of the antique culture, the abolition of the individual soul. Of this cosmic music Mann says that it contained not a single note which was not already present in hellish laughter, for the new Heaven is Pandemonium. The dissolution of Hitler's diabolical régime and the burst of the first atomic bombs over Japan coincide, in the narrative, with the description of the composer's last work, Dr Faustus' Lamentation. The whole bubble of evil is pricked and leaves in its trail the senseless lunacy and the portents of the death of humanity, either through warfare or through the scientific transformation of man. The apocalyptic age has dawned, it is here, and Mann, in common with other writers, notwithstanding his intense irony and delicacy of presentation, trembles at the horror of the great and irrevocable revolt, at the *Apocalypsis cum figuris* which ends the Christian humanism of the West.

It is touching to stand at Mann's graveside, at Zürich, on the Kilchberg cemetery, not far from the house where C. F. Meyer wrote lines of unforgettable poetry about the tranquil peace of the good earth. Many pilgrims can be seen in this beautiful spot and though there is neither speech nor language it requires little imagination to

know what most of them think while they gaze over the lake-side to the blue snow-capped mountains in the East. They give thanks for Mann, the most civilized European, who fought against tyranny and devilishness by the power of the spirit, and they meditate on the ever-present Apocalypse of our day.

Among the many challenges of Mann's work this seems to me the most important: to acknowledge the coming of the ice-age, of the scientific Apocalypse and its inherent evil, and yet to possess such resources of civilized courage as not to bow to the evil. The apocalyptic myth of the ancient serpent has ceased to be a myth but is now fully realized on earth and can be detected in the total absence of Grace in so many quarters. It is the outstanding importance of Mann's Dr Faustus to demonstrate that the diabolical quintessence of our age belongs not merely to the environmental but primarily to the theological plane. Although he was himself no theologian and this novel is not the kind of literature which is commonly discussed among theologians, they can hardly afford to ignore its message. Everywhere our contemporary poets and writers sense the presence of the Apocalyptic age and the hastening towards a *dénouement*, while the totalitarian states practise Hell in the fullest sense and martyrs pray for that act of God which alone can save mankind from itself. Yet the theologians in the Protestant field are inclined to shrug off the legacy of Biblical Apocalyptic, to dismiss the so-called mythical elements: is not this strange and perhaps tragic failure merely adding another ironic and painful feature to our own *Apocalypsis cum figuris*?

A RELIGION BASED ON KINDNESS ¹

CECIL S. EMDEN

Realistic habits of thought

THE HISTORY of the Hebrew people was stormy and precarious, so is not surprising that they regarded their religion predominantly as a means of protection and deliverance from dangers. Such an attitude was especially natural to them, because their habit of mind tended towards giving abstract ideas a concrete significance. This habit has been authoritatively described by Professor S. A. Cook,² who remarked: "To 'remember' [with the Hebrews] implies action; and words for love, hate, anger, covet or desire, cover the practical results of those feelings . . . The words 'save' and 'salvation' imply practical deliverance, and 'peace' is more than a mere passive state. Hebrew thought is throughout practical and realistic."

It is hoped, in this article, to make it apparent that there was a tendency for the Hebrews to apply this usage to certain words used in relation to God which are abstract to our way of thinking, such as "righteousness", "truth", and "judgement", with the result that they came to mean not only something practical, but something helpful.

Due recognition of the correct sense to be attached to such words as these can involve a considerable modification of the prevailing view of the Psalmist's God, and the attitude of the Psalmist towards him. The degree of interest in God's ethical goodness is reduced. Apprehension at the supposedly forbidding character of a strict law-giver and judge is seen to have much less foundation than has hitherto been supposed. And, most notable of all, there is a vastly enlarged appreciation of the practical kindness of God, and of the extent of the reliance of the Psalmist on this kindness.

It can hardly be said that the use of such a word as "righteousness" (in the Revised Version), instead of a more correct word implying practical helpfulness, amounts to a mistranslation. It is no doubt due to a lack of understanding of a rather queer Hebrew addition. But our translators have made a proper comprehension of

the attributes of the Psalmist's God more difficult by some unfortunate and even mistaken translations. A signal example of this is the rendering of the Hebrew word *chesed* as "mercy" in a large majority of its instances in the Revised Version of the Psalms. In a minority of instances, it is much more happily and correctly rendered as "loving-kindness". Some such meaning should often be substituted for "mercy".

"Salvation"

The word translated "salvation" in the Psalms and elsewhere in the Old Testament, when its true meaning in many cases is understood, can provide a key which is valuable in reaching the correct interpretation of other words. The English word, "salvation", it is true, is especially likely, owing to its New Testament associations, to dispose many present-day readers of the Bible to assume that the Hebrew word for which it often stands must have an abstract significance, such as redemption from sin. But this Hebrew word, *yeshuah*, which is usually translated "salvation" in the Revised Version, and which has the root-meaning of "freedom from restriction", came to be understood by the Hebrews in a concrete sense with the meaning of "acts of deliverance". In the Psalms it often means "practical kindness", of which deliverance from trouble is the most obvious expression. The leading authorities on Old Testament theology and criticism are definite in this matter,³ subject to the qualification that, occasionally, *yeshuah* should be understood as implying some spiritual comfort, and, in one or two instances, as referring to deliverance from sins.

In determining the true meaning of such words as *yeshuah* as descriptive of God's attributes much help can be obtained through the study of synonymous parallelism. It can generally be assumed that where two clauses are effectively balanced one against the other, in accordance with the scheme of Hebrew poetry, the meanings of the two clauses are likely to be similar. The two following examples of synonymous parallelism, for instance, make it clear that "salvation" means very much the same as "kindness":

"Shew us thy mercy [kindness], O Lord,
And grant us thy salvation".⁴

"Let thy mercies [kindnesses] also come unto me, O Lord,
Even thy salvation, according to thy word".⁵

"Righteousness"

The Hebrew words *tsedeq* and *tsedaqah* (usually rendered in the Revised Version of the Old Testament as "righteousness") had the root-meaning of firmness, propriety, conformity to an expected standard. But, according to the Hebrew idiom, it acquired a more realistic sense of "fidelity to obligations", or "adherence to rules of conduct", and thence, the definitely concrete meaning of the actual performance of obligations. The Hebrews constantly bore in mind God's promise to them under the covenant, his pledge of kindness, of help in trouble. In the highly insecure circumstances in which they often lived, tolerable existence seemed to them impossible without a helping and protecting God on whom to rely. Thus, when the Psalmist mentioned God's "righteousness", he sometimes had in mind God's assurance of practical kindness, or even the practical kindness itself. As a result of this peculiar mental attitude and the Hebrew propensity to realism, the Hebrew word which we might well imagine would refer to his ethical goodness turns out to mean his practical kindness.

Old Testament scholars are not so definite about the concrete meaning of "righteousness" as they are about that of "salvation", at least in the Psalms. Although there seems to be no adequate reason for the distinction, they are in general definite that the Hebrew words *tsedeq* and *tsedaqah* mean kindness expressed in deliverance when used in Deutero-Isaiah.⁶

The predecessors of the modern experts seem to have been hesitant on this subject,⁷ but recently scholars have begun to recognize the proper interpretation more clearly. W. E. Barnes, in his commentary on the Psalms (1931) says: "'Righteousness', when ascribed to God, often stands for His help or deliverance granted to His servants".⁸ Pedersen states the connection between "righteousness" and "covenant-love" with admirable conciseness. He says: "Righteousness manifests itself in love, because it consists in maintaining the covenant".⁹ G. F. Moore remarks that "righteousness" becomes parallel to the words for deliverance, blessing, and kindness.¹⁰ And Levertoff and Goudge, in commenting on Matt. 5. 6-7¹¹ observe: "The righteousness for which Israel thirsted was that redeeming righteousness of God of which Deutero-Isaiah speaks, and which is practically identical with His merciful fulfilment of His promises."

It is easy to prove a close similarity between "righteousness" and "kindness" by means of synonymous parallelism:

"Gracious is the Lord, and righteous;
Yea, our Lord is merciful [kind]".¹²

"The Lord is righteous in all his ways,
And gracious [beneficent] in all his works".¹³

Moreover, it often becomes obvious from the context, not only that "righteousness" cannot refer to ethical goodness, but in fact signifies positive action, such as kindness in the form of deliverance or help. For instance:

"He shall receive a blessing from the Lord,
And righteousness from the God of his salvation".¹⁴

(The perfect man, described in this verse, would not be likely to welcome the gift of righteousness in the literal sense, for he has, he says, clean hands and a pure heart.)

"Add iniquity unto their iniquity:
And let them not come into thy righteousness".¹⁵

(The Psalmist's infamous and malevolent adversaries are not the sort of people to be attracted by God's moral qualities in any circumstances.)

Striking confirmation of the use of the words literally translated "righteous" and "righteousness" to mean "kind" and "kindness" is to be found in the New Testament. This is not surprising, because the same Semitic proneness to objectivity is operative in both Old and New Testaments. The extension of the usage into the New Testament is of intense interest in illustrating the continuity of the doctrine of kindness, to which reference will be made a little later on.

R. H. Strachan, in his commentary on St John's Gospel, adopts this interpretation in a passage of notable significance (John 16. 8-11), and remarks: "*Righteousness* is not merely a moral quality but a moral activity of God. The content of the term in the New Testament must be interpreted by its content in the Old Testament. *Righteousness* in a [Hebrew] judge means not only that he administers impartial justice, but that he succours the oppressed."

This passage in St John's Gospel can be suggestively compared with one in St Paul's Epistle to the Romans (3. 21-25), where the word "righteousness" is used in a similar connotation, namely the beneficence of our Lord in delivering us from our sins. Professor C. H. Dodd points out¹⁶ that "righteousness" must stand "not only for a moral attribute . . . but also (in accordance with Hebrew usage) for an act or activity". It is "an activity whereby the right is asserted in the deliverance of man from the power of evil."

Bishop Westcott's remarks on 1 John 1. 9, in his book on the Epistles of St John, are also interesting in this connection, where he interprets the word "righteous" as meaning "merciful".

Man's "righteousness" in the New Testament, as well as God's, sometimes relates to kindness.¹⁷

"Faithfulness"

The Hebrew word *emunah*, usually rendered "faithfulness", had as its root-meaning "stability". It came according to Hebrew usage, to be understood as meaning "fidelity to the covenant", and, thence, to mean the performance of obligations under the covenant, especially practical kindness in the form of deliverance or help.¹⁸

The association of "faithfulness" with the covenant between God and Israel is well illustrated in the words of the book of Deuteronomy (7. 9): "Know therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God; the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy [kindness] with them that love him and keep his commandments".

Synonymous parallelism can, once more, prove that the Hebrew word in fact came to signify kindness, for instance:

"But my mercy [kindness] will I not utterly take from him,
Nor suffer my faithfulness to fail".¹⁹

"Truth"

The frequent mention of God's "truth" in the Psalms and elsewhere in the Bible may easily, and sometimes mistakenly, be understood as descriptive of his reliability or integrity, or even no more than his veracity. But it is not difficult to establish that the Hebrew word *emeth*, usually rendered "truth", should often be properly represented by some such expression as "covenant-love" or "covenant-kindness", with an implication similar to that inherent in our semi-obsolete word "troth". Practical compliance with, and fulfilment of, the covenant is involved in such passages as: "Thou hast

redeemed [delivered] me, O Lord, thou God of truth".²⁰ And the synonymity of "truth" with "kindness" can easily be substantiated by profiting from the deductions to be drawn from such Hebrew parallelisms as :

"For thy mercy [kindness] is great above the heavens,
And thy truth reacheth unto the skies".²¹

There are several instances in the Psalms where God's "truth" is mentioned in close relationship with his "kindness". The seeming incongruity of this apposition must have struck numerous students of the Psalms. In such passages as "Let thy loving kindness and thy truth continually preserve me",²² and "God shall send forth his mercy [kindness] and his truth",²³ written in circumstances of great peril, God's abstract virtues would surely seem a most unlikely means of practical deliverance.²⁴

The conjunction of "kindness" and "truth" is also to be found in other parts of the Old Testament besides the Psalms, and in those instances, too, the incongruity of a literal interpretation of "truth" becomes obvious. Jacob, for instance, in addressing God, said: "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies [kindnesses], and of all the truth, which thou hast shewed unto thy servant; . . .".²⁵ And David, in expressing his gratitude to those who had buried Saul, said: "And now the Lord shew kindness and truth unto you . . .".²⁶ The Hebrew word which the Revised Version renders as "truth" should certainly be translated by some such words as "graciousness", "beneficence", or "helpfulness" in these passages.²⁷

"Judgement"

The last of God's seemingly abstract attributes to be considered here is his "judgement". People seem to find it particularly difficult to attach any other meaning to the Hebrew word *mishpat* but the literal one, a judicial sentence, whereas according to Hebrew usage, it often, when used in the books of the Old Testament, developed the meaning of beneficence, that is to say, the concrete expression of God's fidelity to his obligations under the covenant. As Pedersen puts it with his accustomed conciseness: "Judgement and justice came to imply the maintenance of the covenant".²⁸ No wonder the God of the Hebrews has acquired an undue reputation for strictness, when his aptitude for judicial activity has been so much

exaggerated. It is obviously God's kindness that is in the Psalmist's mind when he says:

"He is the Lord our God.

His judgements are in all the earth.

He hath remembered his covenant for ever . . ."29

Many readers of the Psalms must have been puzzled at the apparent desire of the Psalmist to submit himself to justice in such phraseology as : "Judge me, O Lord my God, according to thy righteousness".30 How much more reasonable is the rendering alleged here to be the proper one: "Deliver me, O Lord my God, according to thy covenant-kindness." Thus, instead of a punctilious judge, we see a kindly protector and guardian.

Similarly, the words "He shall judge the world with righteousness"31 seem to suggest a highly formidable God; but when the passage is rendered "He shall relieve the world with his kindness", the impression gained of the Hebrews' God undergoes an agreeable modification.

The same considerations apply to another passage: "Judge [deliver] me, O Lord, for I have walked in mine integrity: I have trusted also in the Lord without wavering . . . For thy loving-kindness is before mine eyes; . . ."32. Why a man who is satisfied that his behaviour has been exemplary should be anxious to submit himself to a judicial decision, it is difficult to imagine.

There are a large number of passages in the Psalms and elsewhere in the Old Testament, and even one or two in the New Testament, where either the context, or implication from parallelism, indicates that some word like "kindness" should be substituted for "judgement". For instance:

"Let my soul live, and it shall praise thee;
And let thy judgements help me".33

"When God arose to judgement,
To save all the meek of the earth".34

While insisting that very often the word "judgement" is used when the proper signification is "kindness", it is necessary to recognize that *mishpat* sometimes involves a disciplinary interposition by God. This, while characterized by forbearance, may be chastening and redemptive. A wrong-doer must submit to God's

decision and to the course God prescribes, for it will be for his good. It may well be that the Psalmist, for instance, will be aware that God's kindness is accompanied by firmness, for that may be the most effective way of being kind".³⁵

A modified view of the Psalmist's God

The arguments advanced in the preceding sections of this article have, it is hoped, helped to establish more than a likelihood that several Hebrew words used to describe the attributes of God often have unexpected meanings owing to the Hebrew proneness to objectivity, to thinking about such matters as religion in a concrete and practical way. If this is so, we have at our disposal a larger body of evidence in support of his beneficence than has hitherto been available. The revised view thus opened makes the abundant trust that the Psalmist so obviously reposed in God more easy to understand. At the same time, the commonly accepted notion of the Psalmist's God, as primarily law-giver and judge, assumes a much reduced importance.

If the Prayer Book Version, the Revised Version, and modern translations of the Psalms were amended so as to comprise the actual meanings of the words describing God's attributes which have been discussed in the preceding sections, the religion of the Hebrews would surely have a more vivid interest for us; and the Psalms would doubtless become more valuable both for public worship and private devotion. The added emphasis on God's kindness, and the reduced prominence given to his strictness, and even sternness, would certainly tend to increase rather than diminish a sense of reverence.

Adequate recognition of God's kindness, as portrayed in the Psalms, in no way derogates from the essential place held by his holiness, implying in him complete opposition to moral evil. It has been well said that the holiness of God is not abolished by his love. Nor need the adequate recognition of God's kindness represent him as an easy-going Deity, disposed to spoil his children.

Christian kindness

The most powerful new light on the art of living shed by the coming of Christianity was generated by the disclosure that God is not merely kind, but that he could exemplify, in his own Person

and in the most intense way, the principle of self-sacrificing kindness.

The later Old Testament prophets forecast this development in the self-revelation of God. In the book of Zechariah, the King that is to come is portrayed as "just" [the Hebrew word should have been rendered as "righteous", in the sense of being "kind"] and having "salvation" [i.e. deliverance], "lowly and riding upon an ass . . . " ³⁶. Prophecy also forecast our Lord's doctrine of self-sacrificing kindness in the book of Isaiah, where God's Son is described as his "servant" or "chosen". "I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgement [beneficent deliverance] to the Gentiles . . . He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgement [the practice of kindness] in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law [teaching] . . . I the Lord have called thee in righteousness [kindness], and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house". ³⁷ The principle of kindness is implicit in every line of this solemn pronouncement.

Between the time of the later prophets and the coming of our Lord there was a set-back in the effectiveness of the doctrine of covenant-kindness. But, with his coming, the principle of kindness as a central factor in religion was not only revived but was endowed with new significance. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another". ³⁸ The essential words are "even as I have loved you." This is the new factor, for God gave practical proof, not only of a kindness that was gracious, ready, and bountiful, but also self-sacrificing.

Of course, the principle of self-sacrificing kindness underlay the whole of Christ's ministry. His formal teaching had reference to it, notably in the Beatitudes, which nearly all bear on the subject, especially the one which forms the culminating point: "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy". ³⁹ Or, more accurately: "Fortunate are the pitiful: for they shall receive pity". Not only is the latter version more accurate, but it also helps to bring out the positive and generous aspects of the Christian religion.

At the end of the story of the good Samaritan, the lawyer replied to our Lord: "He that shewed mercy on him". Surely it is obvious

that it is "kindness" and not "mercy" that was in question, for "mercy" implies forbearance from due imposition of punishment, whereas "kindness" has a wider connotation, involving sympathetic help available to anyone, innocent or guilty. Our Lord's assertion of the basic principles of behaviour between neighbours is significant of the unlimited extent to which he meant kindness to go.

Other passages in the New Testament confirm the central importance of the doctrine of kindness. It is fully treated in the teaching about love recorded in St John's Gospel and in the First Epistles of St John. St Paul insists on it on several occasions very specifically.⁴⁰

The principle of kindness and the Kingdom of God

A few remarks must be added about the connection, which has sometimes been recognized, between the covenant-kindness of the Old Testament and the basis of the Kingdom of God in the New. On several occasions the principle of kindness between God and man, and between fellow-men, is mentioned in the Gospels in connection with the Kingdom of God in such a way as to imply that the two are identical.⁴¹ St Luke pictures our Lord undertaking many healings at Capernaum, and records the attempt of the inhabitants to keep him with them. But our Lord protested that he must continue his mission of healing elsewhere and "preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God to the other cities also: . . ." ⁴²; On other occasions, too, he is described as preaching the Kingdom of God, and at the same time illustrating it by healing disease and all manner of sickness.⁴³ We know that his acts of healing involved a considerable giving of self. He also sent forth his disciples to preach the Kingdom of God, and at the same time to heal the sick.⁴⁴ The connection between beneficent acts of healing and the Kingdom of God is well illustrated by our Lord's remark after he had healed the dumb man: "But if I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."⁴⁵

When the rich man asked our Lord how he could inherit eternal life, he was told to give to the poor and live a life of self-sacrifice, in other words to pledge himself to the practice of kindness. The rich man went away dismayed; and our Lord then remarked how hard it is for rich people to "enter into the kingdom of God".⁴⁶ And, again, when one of the Scribes agreed whole-heartedly with our Lord's exposition of the doctrine of love of God and neighbour, he

was told that he was not far from the Kingdom of God, meaning that he had come near to possessing the qualifications necessary for being admitted into the Kingdom.⁴⁷ These passages certainly go a long way towards establishing an identity between the principle of kindness and the Kingdom.

In more than one instance in St Matthew's Gospel "righteousness, which has already been noted as sometimes synonymous with "kindness" in the Gospels, is made characteristic of the Kingdom of God. For instance: "except your righteousness [? kindness] shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven".⁴⁸ Again: "But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness [? principle of kindness]; and all these things shall be added unto you".⁴⁹ And the principle of kindness, so trenchantly asserted in Luke 6. 27-36, in regard to loving our enemies, and helping those in need without thought of recompense, is closely connected with our Lord's discussion of the qualifications for attaining the Kingdom of God.

* * * *

The doctrine of kindness is obviously a central one in both Old and New Testament theology; and a due appreciation of the continuity of its development can help to deepen the meaning of Christianity by the realization that its essential roots are more firmly set in the pre-Christian past than is generally supposed. We should miss much if we failed to be fully impressed by every possible evidence of God's progressive revelation of himself over the ages.

If the assertion made in the earlier part of this article, in regard to the true interpretation of such words as "righteousness" and "judgement", as used to describe God's attributes, can be sustained, it seems likely that, as is suggested in the later part of the article, the understanding of cognate words in the New Testament may in some instances require corresponding revision. The revisions would be small in number; but even these might well involve questions of prime consequence.

¹ Reference may be made to two earlier articles in this Review by the present writer (vol. CLV, pp. 281 ff., and vol. CLVI, pp. 233 ff.).

² *The Old Testament, A Re-interpretation*, p. 106.

³ Article on "Salvation" in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*; W. Robertson Smith, *The Old Testament and the Jewish Church* (2nd ed. 1892), p. 441; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms* (1939), p. 493.

⁴ Ps. 85. 7. The Revised Version is used throughout this article, in quotations from the Bible.

⁵ Ps. 119. 41.

⁶ G. W. Wade, *Isaiah* (in *Westminster Commentaries*), p. xlvi; A. Guillaume, article on *Isaiah* in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (S.P.C.K.).

⁷ See, for instance, the lack of full comprehension in some earlier experts, e.g. T. K. Cheyne, *The Psalms* (1888), pp. 18, 304; A. B. Davidson, *Theology of the Old Testament* (1904), pp. 133, 396.

⁸ p. 237.

⁹ J. Pedersen, *Israel, Its Life and Culture* (1926 & 1940), vols. 1 & 2, p. 341.

¹⁰ G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (1927-30), vol. 2, p. 171; see also W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, (3rd ed. 1927), pp. 660-1.

¹¹ *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (S.P.C.K.).

¹² Ps. 116. 5.

¹³ Ps. 145. 17; and see Ps. 36. 10, 40. 9-10. 103. 17; also Isa. 51. 6, 51. 8, 61. 10.

¹⁴ Ps 24. 5.

¹⁵ Ps. 69. 27; also Ps. 71. 2, 112. 9, 143. 11: Prov. 31. 9.

¹⁶ *The Epistle to the Romans* (Moffatt Edition), pp. 10, 12, 13.

¹⁷ See Matt. 1. 19, 10. 40-42; Acts 10. 34-35.

¹⁸ Occasionally the word is unsatisfactorily translated "truth" in the R.V.

¹⁹ Ps. 89. 33; and see also Ps. 89. 1, 89. 2, 89. 33, 92. 2, 100. 5.

²⁰ Ps. 31. 5.

²¹ Ps. 108. 4; see also Ps. 57. 10, 117. 2, 119. 160.

²² Ps. 40. 11

²³ Ps. 57. 3.

²⁴ See also Ps. 138. 2, 25. 10, 26. 2-3.

²⁵ Gen. 32. 10.

²⁶ 2 Sam. 2. 6.

²⁷ See also Exod. 18. 21; Micah 7. 20; Tobit 4. 6, 13. 6 ff.; John 3. 21. The word translated "true" in the O.T. should sometimes be translated as "kind". e.g. Zech. 7. 9.

²⁸ *Israel, Its Life and Culture*, vols. 1 & 2, pp. 342, 348-9.

²⁹ Ps. 105. 7-8.

³⁰ Ps. 35. 24.

³¹ Ps. 96. 13.

³² Ps. 26. 1, 3.

³³ Ps. 119. 175.

³⁴ Ps. 76. 9; see also Ps. 10. 17, 119. 52; Deut. 10. 18; Zech. 7. 9; Matt. 23. 23; Luke 11. 42; and for synonymous parallelisms, Ps. 33. 5, 36. 6, 37. 6, 68. 5, 72. 2, 72. 4, 89. 14, 103. 6.

³⁵ There is a good deal of evidence to show that God's "peace", in the Bible, should sometimes be interpreted objectively, as meaning his beneficence; but this argument cannot be developed here. See Jer. 16. 5, 33. 6.

³⁶ Zech. 9. 9.

³⁷ Isa. 42. 1-7.

³⁸ John 13. 34; also 15. 12-13.

³⁹ Matt. 5. 7.

⁴⁰ E.g. Gal. 5. 22-23; Eph. 4. 32, 5. 2; Col. 3. 12-14.

⁴¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. CLV, pp. 281 ff.

⁴² Luke 4. 43.

⁴³ Matt. 4. 23, 9. 35-36; Luke 9. 11.

⁴⁴ Matt. 10. 7-8; Luke 9. 2, 10. 8-9.

⁴⁵ Luke 11. 20.

⁴⁶ Mark 10. 21-23; cf. Mark 8. 34.

⁴⁷ Mark 12. 33-34.

⁴⁸ Matt. 5. 20.

⁴⁹ Matt. 6. 33.

CORRESPONDENCE

OUR LORD'S ASCENSION

SIR,—My concern that the Christ-Event should be clothed in terms which are worthy of it—pitifully inadequate though all human terms must be—is my excuse for craving space to reply to the Reverend G. F. Dowden.

1. I must be allowed to say quite emphatically that I was not concerned to deny the Exaltation-Glorification of the Risen Lord. I am certainly concerned to assert that we need to be on our guard against a use of language which suggests that men saw the glorification of Jesus, in the same way in which I am sometimes unfortunate enough to see the tail-light of the Paddington-Taplow train. Apart from Acts 1, there is not a line in the New Testament which entails a belief that men did witness the Exaltation of Jesus. The Ascension is a fact—and a “fact” is an assumed relation between two things. It remains for Mr Dowden to search his metaphysics and tell us what he means by an event. If he insists on a “physical Ascension”—his own phrase—he must first give some account of the Resurrection-body of the Lord. (Whence, for example, did the Risen Lord obtain the clothes he was wearing when he appeared to the Eleven?) If Mr Dowden insists that his chosen terminology is correct, then we are entitled to have from him some understanding of *descendit*, not to mention *sedet ad dexteram dei patris*. A physical ascension demands a local heaven, and a local heaven implies a local deity.

2. Your correspondent reads the Lucan account in the most unlikely places. *Analemphthe eis ton ouranon* (Mark 16. 19); *anephereto eis ton ouranon* (Luke 24. 52)—certainly an exaltation, certainly a return to the Father, certainly *ascendit ad caelos* in the manner of the Creeds; but where is the statement that there was a Waygood-Otis lift between a locality in Palestine and a local heaven? Precisely because there was no outward manifestation, no sign, an apostle can be represented by Luke in Acts 2 as expecting a Messiah yet to come. (Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, *J.T.S.*, vii.1,n.s.) If Mr Dowden will have a “physical Ascension”, I am driven to ask what conceivable meaning he can attach to the assertion that Queen Elizabeth II “ascended the throne”—which she did many months ere the ceremony in Westminster. Was there an esoteric ceremony at the Palace in the presence of witnesses?

3. I confess to considerable alarm at the interpretation offered of Mark 14. 62—the *ap'arti* of Matthew 26. 64 and the utterly unambiguous *apo tou nun* of Luke 22. 69 (the parallels to Mark) refer to the *vindication* of Jesus in the Passion, not an Ascension. Or is Mr Dowden telling us that

the high-priest saw the Exaltation? John indeed implies that that was the case—and in John the Exaltation is the Cross. I suggest a reference to the article on *nun* in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*, or, more shortly, to Fuller's *Mission and Achievement of Jesus* and Robinson's *Jesus and His Coming*.

4. It is when we come to the end of your correspondent's letter that the real burden of the matter is reached. It is not that the idea of a physical Ascension is "extremely difficult for the twentieth century"—it is frankly impossible. But this is trivial compared with the treatment accorded to the Fourth Gospel. Mr Dowden remarks that "... admittedly it is difficult to reconcile John 20. 17 and 27 with the Marcan and Lucan accounts of the Ascension." So is dismissed what Hoskyns could call the prolegomenon to the study of the rest of the New Testament, and of the Old Testament as well. Such a cavalier dismissal of the massive theological structure of the Fourth Gospel argues a liberalism which I am sure must be as foreign to your correspondent as it is to me.

Mr Dowden would appear to be so mesmerised with the Lucan account of things as to have missed the eschatological character of the Ascension feast, and to have lost sight utterly of the fact that Luke was not an eye-witness—whatever else he might have been. If we are to have the Lucan account of the Glorification of Jesus-Messiah we mustn't pick and choose; we must take the chronology too. And here we come to the question raised by the average intelligent catechism-child: "Where was Jesus after the Resurrection, when he wasn't appearing to the disciples?" That the Glorification "took place" on Easter Day, Dr Davies rightly describes as a "commonplace of contemporary New Testament scholarship".

C. S. MANN

Nashdom Abbey,
Burnham,
Bucks.

THE ANGLICAN-PRESBYTERIAN REPORT

SIR,—Dr H. E. W. Turner has made a telling and useful point when, in his friendly criticisms of my remarks about the Episcopal-Presbyterian Report,¹ he invited me to repair my omission to give a succinct definition of the term "priesthood". I must admit that I do not find this easy, and it is rendered more difficult by the fact that "priesthood", like its correlative "sacrifice", is one of the concepts that suffered badly in the Middle Ages from an unbalanced and impoverished understanding, and that, as a result of this, subsequent discussions have often become inconclusive and ill-tempered. As time goes on we shall, I imagine, get a

¹ C.Q.R., Vol. CLIX. (July-Sept. 1958).

good deal of help from the Biblical and patristic revivals and also from some of the work now being done in the field of anthropology; even if some of his conclusions are disputed, such a work as Dr R. K. Yerkes's *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism* is both illuminating and stimulating.

Perhaps, however, we can make a start from the New Testament and the Report itself. "Every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins. . . . So Christ also. . . ." (Heb. v. 11). Now we hear a great deal from Protestants about something which is sometimes called "the priesthood of the whole Church" and sometimes "the priesthood of all believers". Sometimes, less helpfully, it is called "the priesthood of the laity"; less helpfully, because presumably those who use the phrase do not usually mean to exclude the clergy from the function or status to which they refer, though it has been suggested that the phrase is sometimes used, not in order to imply that the laity are priests, but merely that the clergy are not. The first thing I want to ask is how seriously these phrases are taken by those who use them.

Let us first of all set aside any late medieval *doctrina Romanensium* which would suggest that the sacrifice which Jesus offered in his own flesh and blood is in any way *insufficient* or can be in any way *repeated*. Let us agree that in the order of primary efficient causality there is only one sacrifice—Christ's sacrifice—and only one priesthood—Christ's priesthood—and that any other effective sacrifice and priesthood can only be a participation in his. Let us also agree, if we can, that it is on the whole irrelevant to argue whether in the Eucharist Jesus offers himself or Jesus offers us or we offer Jesus or we offer ourselves or nobody offers anybody, but that the Whole Christ, Head and members, offers the Whole Christ, since by their union with him the members are drawn into the offering of their Head. Given all this, is it or is it not admitted that the "whole Church", "all believers" or "the laity" are priestly in the sense of Hebrews v. 11 or not? If not, then the phrases in question are simply misleading.

The Report tells us that "the whole Church as the Body of Christ participates in his threefold ministry as Prophet, Priest, and King, by serving him as Lord" (p. 8). The somewhat indefinite phrase "serving him as Lord", which might seem to include within the Church unbaptised Salvationists, Quakers, and many Unitarians, is in fact made more explicit on the following page: "The whole Church . . . shares in his priestly ministry in that it is consecrated to be a holy people, offering itself as a living sacrifice to God through Christ, and it is entrusted with the ministry of reconciliation through the Word and Sacraments and of intercession in lifting up the world to God." As my previous paragraph will suggest, I am not very happy about the statement that the Church offers itself, which seems to me to be a bit of vestigial pseudo-medievalism, but no doubt the words "through Christ" may be understood as restoring the unity of the Head with the members. The Report may therefore be taken as adumbrating a satisfactory

doctrine of the priesthood of the Church, though there would seem to be room for a good deal of further development in the thought. Now, however, we come to the real point, which I still hold that the Report failed to face: given that the whole Church is priestly, what of the ordained ministry?

We might expect to be told that, if the whole Church is priestly, its ministry is priestly too. The Report indeed tells us that "all ministry in the Church is to be exercised within the corporate priesthood of the whole Church" (p. 8), and we might be tempted to take this as meaning that the whole Church is caught up into Christ's Godward offering of himself and that the ministry has some special part in this great sacrificial and priestly movement. Two points must, however, be noted. First, the ministry spoken of is not the ordained ministry, but something wider; "within this wider exercise of ministry there is a specific ministry of the Word and Sacraments to which by ordination some are set apart", and, although among the functions of the ordained ministry *episcopate* is included, priesthood is not. Second, the word "within" is not free from ambiguity; you can be *within* a train if you are in fact walking along the corridor in the opposite direction from that in which the train is going. And indeed something very much like this is suggested by the words "All ministry in the Church is to be interpreted as a ministry of Christ to the Church, that is from the Head to the Body as a whole". (p. 8, italics mine.) If it is the essence of priesthood to be directed towards God and if the Church as a whole is priestly because its life is directed towards God in and through Christ, then a ministry which is described exclusively as from Christ to the Body might seem to be the direct opposite of priesthood. It might perhaps be said that, since the Church has just been described as participating in Christ's "threefold ministry as Prophet, Priest, and King", the words "from the Head to the Body as a whole" are not meant as an exhaustive description but refer to the ministry's participation in the *prophetic* aspect of the Church; but if so we are told nothing about the *priestly* aspect at all. (The *regal* aspect is perhaps outlined later on in the discussion of *episcopate*.) Taking the passage as a whole, and noting also the assertion on page 9 that "when a man is ordained to the ministry, he does not act apart from the Body, but acts for the Head to the Body in particular ways" (italics mine), it seems most natural to conclude that what the Report is in fact saying is that the whole Church has a corporate priesthood which is a movement towards God, but that, within this movement, the ministry exercises a function in the opposite direction and so is not priestly at all. At the very least we cannot help noticing that, whereas the Report enthusiastically ascribes priesthood, in a carefully defined sense, to the Church as a whole, it pointedly refrains from applying the word "priesthood" in any sense whatever to the ordained ministry. This can hardly be an accident, and it suggests that the Commission lost its nerve when it came face to face with what might have been a turbulent but would have certainly been a rewarding task.

I am not just making a debating point. Canon Balmforth, whose little work *The Royal Priesthood* is much more important than its modest size would suggest and might well be taken as a basis for any further conversations, has commented on the odd way in which Protestant theologians tend to divorce the ministry from the priestly body of the Church. Commenting on the words of the Baptists in reply to the Lambeth Appeal "We hold firmly the priesthood of all believers and therefore have no separated order of priests", he remarks: "If a priestly body exists, it seems highly probable that the ministerial organs of the body have a ministerial priesthood to exercise in and for the body".² The Anglican-Presbyterian Report does not go as far as the Baptist utterance just quoted, but it certainly refrains from committing itself in the opposite sense.

I think Dr Turner admits this point when he writes that "the concept of a ministerial priesthood, certainly exercised before God, but within and towards the Church, and through her to the world at large, is at least a thoroughly permissible Anglican starting point and might well represent the intention of the Report" (p. 353, italics mine), though, in view of the fact to which I have just pointed, I think his word "might" should be heavily stressed. But in any case I find it a little difficult to appreciate his suggestion that persons who think with me are attempting to impose a particular view on the Church of England, in contrast to the comprehensive Anglicanism which he implies is expressed by the Anglican contribution to the Report. The words which I have just quoted from him seem to me to express a very definite view, though a view which I personally hold to be one-sided and incomplete; so does his approbation of Headlam and Quick. I find it very difficult to recognize that Dr Turner's own view, or that (apparently the same one) which he ascribes to the Anglican signatories of the Report, are any more obviously representatively Anglican than are my own. What, however, is the significance of the diversity of Anglican views which is so constant a feature of reunion discussions?

The diversity of theological opinions which can be found in Anglicanism is, of course, well known if not indeed notorious. It is often praised as one of our glories. My own answer to the question whether theological diversity is a good thing is the somewhat banal one that it depends on the kind and the extent of the diversity. I cannot but feel that the present diversity within Anglicanism, which sadly impairs the Church's witness to the outside world, which has more than once brought Anglicanism to the verge of disruption and which produces periodical secessions, is somewhat excessive. Furthermore, it can be manipulated in a very misleading way, as was exemplified by the Methodist reactions to Dr Fisher's famous Cambridge sermon. I have discussed this in detail in chapter vii of my book *The Recovery of Unity* and will only briefly indicate the point here. A definite demand was made by the Methodists that in any plan for reunion the same

² C.Q.R., CXLVII (Oct.-Dec. 1948), p. 6.

liberty of interpretation of the nature of episcopacy and priesthood would be accorded to the Methodist Church as prevails in the Church of England. What in fact was concealed behind this apparently reasonable and broad-minded requirement was simply that the Methodists should be free to continue to impose on their members the particular view of the ministry which is embodied in the Methodist Deed of Union, a view which can no doubt be found in the Church of England but which excludes all other views. Nevertheless, there is one hopeful aspect in our diversity, even if it must be recognized as excessive and perilous. The sharply defined positions of the various Protestant bodies largely embody the false theses and counter-theses with which the sixteenth century bristled as a result of the inheritance by all parties of uncriticized late-medieval assumptions; it is certainly a good thing not to be tied down to those. On the other hand, we certainly need, both for the purity of the faith and for sheer practical efficiency, much less doctrinal diversity in Anglicanism than we now have. We may do something to achieve this, and to further the union of Christendom in general, if we try, not just to synthesize the sixteenth-century formulations, for that would only intensify the disease, but to get behind them and the situation out of which they emerged. As I suggested in my article, it is its failure either to attempt or even to recognize this task that seems to me to be the chief weakness of the Anglican-Presbyterian Report. I am rejoiced to read Dr Turner's statement that he would be glad if the Churches were to resume discussions on the kind of question which I had raised. Given the circumstances under which the Report was produced, it was perhaps as good as could be expected. But it certainly ought not to be spared the minutest examination, nor did it ask to be. I cannot help wondering whether the defect to which I have pointed may have partly accounted for the disappointing and violently negative reception which the Report has met in many Presbyterian circles. I do not suppose that memories of far-off things and battles long ago had no part in this. Nevertheless the Scottish mind is deeply theological, and it may be because of a hardly conscious awareness that the basic theological issues were not being faced, that the Report seemed to many convinced Presbyterians to be simply an unprincipled attempt to foist administrative officials upon the people of God. And this, needless to say, was far from its intention.

E. L. MASCALL

Christ Church,
Oxford.

REVIEWS

THE BRETHREN

HISTORY OF THE MORAVIAN CHURCH. By EDWARD LANGTON. George Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

"NO MAN liveth unto himself" (Rom. 14. 7). So ran the text engraved on the ring worn by each member of "The Order of the Mustard Seed", a society founded at Halle by Count Zinzendorf when he was only sixteen. Boys belonging to this club swore "to be kind to all men, true to Christ, and to send the gospel to the heathen". Though the first five members were of different communion, they never spent time in disputing about the points whereon they differed. This club was later to enrol John Potter, Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man, Cardinal Noailles, and General Oglethorpe. Twelve years after this society was founded, on 12 May 1927, to be exact, the Moravian Church began its modern history, when Count Zinzendorf, having discovered a copy of Comenius' treatise on the constitution of the Ancient Church which had been dispersed and to all purposes destroyed a century before, reconstructed it.

Was Zinzendorf really founding a new church, and not reconstructing the Church of the United Brethren in 1727? Dr Edward Langton follows J. E. Hutton (whose undocumented *Short History* published sixty-three years ago, is still immensely readable) and agrees that when Zinzendorf found the *Ratio Disciplinae* in a library at Zittau he was "discovering the old laws". These "old laws" are those of the first Protestant Church in Europe; a church which sprang from the flames that had roasted John Huss to death on 6 July 1415 and Jerome of Prague on 30 May 1416.

They were, like Zinzendorf's laws, based on a community life. The community was the asylum secured for the Taborites from George Podiebrad at Kunwald near Lititz by Archbishop Rockyzan. It was Rockyzan's nephew, Gregory (a former monk), who took the initiative in calling a conference in 1457 where a church fellowship was formed. To prevent it being mistaken for a new monastic order, they called themselves "Brethren". And, when joined by others they became the "United Brethren".

It was this church which nourished Comenius, and its dispersal in 1627 led Comenius to begin his wanderings over Europe. Comenius drafted the *Ratio Disciplinae* which Zinzendorf discovered, and it was Comenius who contributed to the Moravians becoming so interested in the training of the young. In England alone Fulneck and Ockbrook have proud traditions in the field of education. Zinzendorf's importance was further enhanced by his impact on, amongst others, John Wesley. Wesley consulted the Moravian Bishop David Nitschmann, as to whether he

should go forward with his marriage to Miss Sophie Hopkey of Savannah, and took the advice to proceed no further.

Herrnhut, Zinzendorf's headquarters near Dresden, became a radio-active nucleus of missionary activity. Both in England and America they have left their mark, and it might have been a bigger one had not Benjamin La Trobe insisted that the Brethren be a church within a church. As Dr Langton says (p. 144):

One can hardly help but admire and appreciate the spirit of unity, and the humble-mindedness which led the Brethren at this time to become hand-maidens, so to speak, to the Church of England. Whether, however, this mode of operation was wise and helpful from their own point of view—of building up an independent, self-governing Church—may be questioned.

As a result the power exercised by the Moravian preachers dwindled. Economic causes contributed to break up their communities. To-day their General Synods meeting every six years and given continuity from one to another by a General Directory, rule the four fully self-dependent churches. These, in Germany, England, America, and the missions illustrate their claim to be the first international Protestant Church. No Protestant confession has ever been less spiced with sectarian ambitions, and Dr Langton is right in claiming (p. 169) that "its traditional friendly attitude and links with Christians of all other branches of the Evangelical Church of Christ . . . should enable it to make a notable contribution to the Ecumenical Movement".

In his well-written, imaginative, and satisfying book, Dr Langton has told the story of his church with perceptive insight into its difficulties. Yet one would like to see another study of its influences on the Anglican Church. Charles Kingsley was influenced by them, and saw that they offered a far more satisfying example of Christian Socialism in their communities than did the Owenites. The Moravians, more than the rationalists of the eighteenth century, helped to thaw the glacial frigidity of Augustan calm. And they did this, not by heated apostolates, but by social service. What, one muses, would be the position of the Church to-day had Wesley remained a Moravian? And what would be the position of the Church of England?

W. H. G. ARMYTAGE

SAINTLY BISHOP

NEVILLE GORTON: BISHOP OF COVENTRY, 1943-55. Edited by F. MOYLE. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

AT FORMAL assemblies of the Church Neville Gorton was either asleep or exploding like a jumping firework; and those who met him only on such occasions were given no clue to the secret of his power until he broke into his smile—the smile brilliantly captured and reproduced on

the dust-cover of this book. In that smile was revealed the man, quixotic, sensitive, spontaneous, lovable, affectionate; more than affectionate, on fire with charity.

A formal biography of such a man would probably fall flat, and it has therefore been a wise choice to allow his friends to write of him as they knew him, as friend, schoolmaster, and father-in-God. The variety and lightness of touch made possible by this treatment suggests the mercurial vitality of the subject; and makes all the more impressive the unanimity of the witness of the contributors.

For beneath the moods and hieroglyphics and defects of his temperament there was the man of God, the teacher with a genius for discovering, releasing, and developing hidden powers, the artist with the seeing eye, the evangelist yearning that the hungry sheep should be fed, the prophet burning with indignation and charity. And these gifts and qualities were fused by the fire of the Holy Ghost to make a saint.

Where the capacity for friendship in most of us is limited or tainted with condescension, in the saint it is uninhibited, simple, and graced with humility. In this deepest sense Gorton was a man of courtesy.

Where most of us are content at most to go the first mile in lending a hand, the saint will go the second mile. So it is that we read of the Bishop of Coventry giving three hours to a young couple in distress late on a Saturday night.

Where most of us are concerned for our reputation, the saint will risk it because he does not think of himself at all, but is eager for the truth. A fine example of this is found in "Plain speaking on the Anglican attitude to the Church of South India" (pp. 144-6).

Of all the words by which the New Testament tries to express the meaning of Christian ministry, it is *agon* and its derivatives which come to mind in thinking of Neville Gorton. "He was always wrestling". He gloried in his share of the sufferings of Christ, and he was in travail until Christ be formed in his boys and in his people.

✠ EDMUND TRURON :

"THE CARTESIAN FAUX-PAS"

THE SELF AS AGENT. By JOHN MACMURRAY. Faber and Faber. 25s.

"ALL meaningful knowledge is for the sake of action, and all meaningful action for the sake of friendship." This is the theme of Professor Macmurray's Gifford Lectures. The first part of his thesis is developed in this book, which contains the lectures delivered in the Spring of 1952. The second series of lectures, delivered the following year, will be published shortly under the title, "Persons in Relation", and will develop the second theme.

The Self as Agent is not an easy book in thought or language. Complexity of thought may be inevitable, if Professor Macmurray is right

in thinking that "we are living through a period of revolutionary change", the scale of which "must dwarf the transformation of medieval into modern Europe". He describes his own contribution as "a stumbling advance in country where there are no beaten paths to follow, and where every step may lead us astray."

When we are invited to advance into unknown country, we need the more urgently the aid of a clarity of style. Other readers besides the reviewer may well stumble and have to read again, when they come across sentences such as the following: "From the standpoint of the Agent cognition is included in action, as the negative aspect of action, without which action would not be action but merely happening there would be no acts but only events." In fairness it must be admitted that this sentence is an extreme example, and possibly something has gone wrong here with the revision of the proof.

The main thesis of the book is, however, clear. It is a criticism of the whole Western tradition in Philosophy, which began with the *Cogito ergo sum* of Descartes. Professor Macmurray would probably agree with the comment of an earlier Gifford lecturer, William Temple, on "the Cartesian Faux-pas": "If I were asked what was the most disastrous moment in the history of Europe, I should be strongly tempted to answer that it was that period of leisure, when René Descartes, having no claims to meet, remained for a whole day, 'shut up alone in a stove'."

In place of the Cartesian formula, Professor Macmurray proposes that "we should substitute the 'I do' for the 'I think' as our starting-point and centre of reference; and do our thinking from the standpoint of action". This new starting-point is developed in four propositions. 1. The Self is agent and exists only as agent. 2. The Self is subject but cannot exist as subject. It can be subject only because it is agent. 3. The Self is subject in and for the Self as agent. 4. The Self can be agent only by being also subject.

While most of the book is concerned with an exposition of the writer's own views, rather than a criticism of the views of others, occasional references help us to place his thesis amid other trends in Philosophy. He disclaims one obvious possible implication of his thesis when he writes: "It does not justify a pragmatic theory of truth nor suggest that we should not seek knowledge for its own sake." Of logical empiricism and existentialism he writes: "When I turn to choose between the other two schools, I find I can accept neither." The view that "metaphysical assertions are meaningless" is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the standpoint that "I think" is the primary postulate of all knowledge. In his study of other writers, Professor Macmurray gives most place to Immanuel Kant, whom he describes as "the most adequate of modern philosophers", and "unique in the comprehensive unity of his thought".

The substitution of "I do" for "I think" leads in the closing chapters to a study of the resulting implications for theories of perception, of space and time, of freedom and causation. The treatment of causation leads to a conclusion, a little surprising, but no doubt welcome in these

days when we all do our own washing up: "The question, Why did you break that glass? has no answer, and is inadmissible. I should reply, I didn't; it was a pure accident."

In his survey of Immanuel Kant, Professor Macmurray makes the criticism that "he fails to do justice to the religious aspect of human experience". In his own final chapter, he writes that "to think the Self as agent is to think the unity of the world as a unity of action". This leads him to say at the close that "the argument which starts from the primacy of the practical moves steadily in the direction of a belief in God".

We may look forward to a further exposition of this theme, when the promised second volume deals with "the question of the inter-relation of selves—the proposal to substitute the 'You and I' for the solitary 'I' of the philosophical tradition". Meanwhile Professor Macmurray has challenged us in this first volume to question many accustomed assumptions. "To change our standpoint is to transform our habits of thought. It is not to exchange one theory for another, but to change the basis of all theory. To achieve this must, it seems to me, be a long co-operative process." One reader at least feels that he would have to read and ponder this book several times, if he is to understand and accept its challenge. A second, and if need be a third, reading the book most certainly deserves.

G. F. ALLEN

GOD'S ACCOUNT OF HIMSELF

GOD AND US. By JEAN DANIELOU. (Trans. WALTER ROBERTS.) Mowbray. 22s. 6d.

IT IS unfortunate that the name of the distinguished Jesuit author of this work should be known to most English-speaking Christians only from a not-very-felicitous excursion into the realms of devotional literature. The publishers, therefore, are to be congratulated on making known to a far wider public something of the erudition of Père Daniélou. It is to be hoped most sincerely that there is more to come.

To do justice to the magisterial range of this work is impossible in a short review, but the plan of the author is indicated in the Preface: "My plan in this book is, then, not to say what *I* say of God, but what God has said of himself." Daniélou progresses from the God of the religions, through the pagan philosophers, to the Biblical revelation of God consummated in the God-Man Christ Jesus, and from thence to a consideration of the work of the Church in expounding and interpreting the data of revelation. In days of ever-increasing interest in evolutionary religion, in myth-ritual and "patternism", it is a relief to hear the word *pagan* used without qualification of the natural religions (which the author rightly holds to be not natural at all, but an elaboration of the natural). Whether God is big or little, whether the Absolute Abstraction

of the philosophers or the petty Divinity of mere religiosity—all this and more comes within the broad sweep of a study which ranges with deceptive ease from Plato to Kierkegaard, from Aristotle to the Positivists. "Nothing", we are told, "can be more dangerous than a religion which claims to have outdistanced reason; it can only lead to fanaticism, illuminism, obscurantism; it is lost in a jungle of superstition." There is no shirking of the limit-problems—pain, for example—and no shirking of the uneasy dualism of omnipotence and human freedom. From an author who rescued Origen from the Philistine clutches of Epiphanius and Orosius we should not expect easy panaceas—and we do not get them.

Pungent warnings are to be found against the sterility of a later scholasticism divorced from Biblical concepts, in a chapter which explores in deceptively small compass the whole realm of revelation in the Scriptures. "What strictly constitutes the biblical revelation of God [is] the knowledge of the ways of the living God through His acts in the history of salvation . . ." The discussion on divine righteousness and human justice is particularly fine, while the survey on the emergence of our understanding of the Trinity (in "The God of Jesus Christ") leaves nothing to be desired in a book of this size.

Scattered all through this very valuable work are correctives and re-orientations, for one of which there can be nothing but profound gratitude—a plea for the reunion of scientific exegesis and rational theology, coupled with the marriage of contemplative prayer with speculative theology.

At the risk of appearing ungrateful for such varied fare as the author lays before us from the richness of his treasure, we venture a criticism. Unfortunately, it must be at the point where an Anglican might be expected to make it—on the whole matter of the teaching authority of the Church. Père Daniélou's fifth chapter must be read with care—he does not waste a word—and it will repay much consideration. But his criticisms of Cullmann would presumably be the same if addressed to an Anglican—who cannot see that the establishment of the Papacy as an instrument under God for the unification of the West necessarily involves an acceptance of other claims supposedly to be read from the New Testament. And while Père Daniélou is careful to say how perilous can be the translation of Biblical terms into other languages, it remains to be asked whether the Church must for ever be bound to the language (and the thought-forms) of an *imperium* in which alone terms such as *magisterium* and *infallibilitas* have validity. Our objection—that it takes an infallible pupil to recognize an infallible teacher—remains.

For the book as a whole there can be nothing but gratitude. It ought to be compulsory reading for any man who would take his faith seriously.

Your reviewer must allow himself the luxury of being a little taken aback at the price demanded for format, binding, and paper—in spite of the manifest worth of the book.

C. S. MANN

CHINESE PHILOSOPHY

FIFTY YEARS OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHY, 1898-1950. By O. BRIERE, S.J.

Translated by LAURENCE G. THOMPSON. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

THIS is a very reliable and clear outline, and meets a real need. It was originally published in French in the Bulletin of the (Roman Catholic) Aurora University, Shanghai, and now is translated into English. It should be said that it reads only very occasionally like a translation (for example, in the regular use of Occidental and Oriental, where most of us would speak of Western and Eastern): and only very rarely is one reminded that the translator is American ("to retrograde" as a verb was new to this reviewer—cf. p. 40, "Buddhism as a religion is retrograding"). There are virtually no misprints—quite an achievement in a book like this.

The book falls into three, or four, parts. First, a general survey, the movement of ideas in China from 1898 to 1950, including Darwinian and Spencerian evolutionism, Hu Shih and the pragmatism of Dewey, the controversy between Marxists and anti-Marxists, the aestheticism of Ts'ai Yuan-p'ei, and neo-Buddhist philosophy.

The second part deals more in detail with systems regarded as primarily of Oriental derivation: here are included the modernized Buddhism of T'ai Hsü, the positivistic neo-Confucianism of Fung Yu-lan and the idealistic neo-Confucianism of Ho Lin. The next part reviews systems of Occidental derivation, such as various idealisms, Marxism, and scientific determinism.

The last part, an appendix, a substantial proportion of the whole volume (40 pages out of 148) consists of two bibliographies, not claimed to be exhaustive, but which seem to cover everything of importance, of the principal Chinese philosophical works of the last fifty years, and of writings in Western languages on contemporary Chinese thought.

Father Brière is an expert in this field, and his work is a very comprehensive one. It is based on Chinese sources, and it is good to have the Chinese characters for the authors and titles of works which he quotes or lists: indeed, it is essential in any scholarly work.

The translator, in his foreword, comments on the dearth of materials concerning Chinese philosophy available in Western languages: and among the materials we do possess, a disproportionate amount, as he says, deals only with the period of antiquity. It is because of this that we welcome very warmly a comprehensive and scholarly survey such as this is. There is nothing like it, so far as this reviewer at least knows, in any Western language.

The late E. R. Hughes, formerly Reader in Chinese Philosophy in the University of Oxford, in an appreciative Preface, refers to Father Brière's diligent cataloguing. This must not be misunderstood to mean that we have here only a catalogue of names. The book is far from this. It could so easily be, but in fact is not, overloaded with detail: it is clear and concise, while at the same time thorough and comprehensive. It is also

objective and reliable. One might have liked a longer survey: but the book does not set out to be more than an outline.

The plan of the work necessarily involves some repetition. And one was somewhat surprised to find Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles of the People included among systems of Eastern rather than Western origin: the first of these principles, after all, was government by and for the people, and they were in origin at least to some extent a Chinese adaptation of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

It will be realized that Father Brière is not concerned with philosophy only in the sense of abstract and academic metaphysical theories. And so he includes, though briefly, in his purview both in the early years of the century the *Book of the Universal Concord* (referred to by Mr Derk Bodde in his translation of Fung Yu-lan's *History of Chinese Philosophy* as the "Book of the Great Unity") of the great reforming statesman K'ang Yu-wei: in Kang's picture of a world Utopia, the world is divided into three thousand administrative squares, marriage contracts are valid for one year only, and there is no private ownership of any agricultural, industrial, or commercial enterprise: and also the New Life Movement, inaugurated by Chiang Kai-shek in 1934, based on the four Confucian virtues of sincerity, reason, honesty, and honour.

Father Brière's survey shows by its very objectivity how very largely the intellectual atmosphere in China has been dominated for most of the last fifty years by positivistic and Marxist thought—these schools have in fact almost divided the field between them. The Communist accession to power in 1949 certainly came as no bolt out of the blue.

This book is highly competent and trustworthy, and will be very useful. It should help greatly towards the greater knowledge and understanding of Asia, not least China, in Europe and America, which is of such crucial importance for the future of the world: the translator and publishers are to be congratulated on making it accessible to the English-reading public.

G. F. S. GRAY

AN ACTIVIST PHILOSOPHY

BENEDICT DE SPINOZA. By H. F. HALLETT. Athlone Press. 25s.

SPINOZA has often been supposed to be one of the arch-enemies of the Christian religion. For David Hume he was "that famous atheist" who had "infamous" sentiments and a "hideous hypothesis", though, said Hume with considerable relish, those who develop traditional arguments for the soul as a "simple and indivisible substance" must come under the same condemnation. As Miss Colie has recently reminded us, not even Cambridge Platonists like More and Cudworth, "recognised in Spinoza more than an Epicurean, an atomic atheist, a mechanical philosopher like all the rest, making no concession whatever to the

supreme truth of revelation". And of course he was one of the first textual critics of the Bible. Yet we may recall that Hale White thus summarized Spinoza's achievements: "The enlargement of the idea of God: the removal of God from the provincial and petty position He had formerly occupied, and the introduction of unity into our conceptions of man and nature." In fact, as Professor Hallett says, Spinoza has been called "monist, pantheist, atheist, acosmist, ethical nihilist, mechanist, mystic, and even dialectical materialist", epithets which show at once how his readers have misunderstood him, imposing on his exposition the categories of another day. In particular: "It is not easy for the modern mind, steeped as it is in the sophistical heresies of a truncated empiricist philosophy . . . to take up the intellectual standpoint from which alone the thought of Spinoza is intelligible."

It is almost thirty years ago since Professor Hallett gave us *Aeternitas*, a Spinozistic study by which he hoped to illuminate our thought about eternity, and to show that Spinoza can help us towards a reasonable alternative to both the "threatened night of mortality", and "the nightmare of immortality" conceived as an endless serial existence. Spinoza, he thought, can help us to put questions about eternity into a form which, avoiding the "pictorial, and therefore inadequate, metaphysics of popular theology", enables them to yield to an ever increasing insight, and "without resort to imagination or a shoddy mysticism".

Though this new book is quite independent of its predecessor, Professor Hallett here continues and develops his earlier endeavours, in the belief that, by wrestling with Spinoza's ideas, problems about God, ourselves, and the world will be refashioned and illuminated. His exposition of Spinoza is not only based on the *Ethics*, but there are many references to the other works of Spinoza, especially his *Theological-Political Treatise*, his *Political Treatise*, his *Treatise on the Emendation of the Understanding*, and his correspondence.

Most commentators on Spinoza would agree that the main problem for Spinoza is how to connect timeless terms timelessly related with spatio-temporal terms spatio-temporally related. Professor Hallett's clue for the solution of this problem is that we must take activity or action rather than "thinghood" as our guiding concept. Along the same lines, we are not to think that cause is a scientific concept relating to "objects". It is no "impotent category of positivistic theory; it is the power to actualise". In this way Spinoza's philosophy is from first to last "activist". To exist is to act. Here—in action—we have a concept uniting at the outset "potency" and "actuality". So, says Professor Hallett, Spinoza's conception is of a primordial Real as a "duality in unity of cause and effect, potency and actuality", which is self-actualized in an infinite number of ways; each infinitely differentiated, until we reach the "durational world of common experience and science". "Action which is thus originally and essentially eternal . . . becomes durational only by limitation and modification."

Ordinary things—ourselves as well as physical objects—are thus "imperfectly active", but morality is a means by which our privation

can be reversed. Further, since actions vary in perfection of agency, they therefore differ in degrees of freedom. Finite beings are only "free" as referred to God and when in perfect community with their complement. But as for the charge of "determinism": only in so far as to "act" is to determine a particular issue in a particular way, is Spinoza's doctrine to be called deterministic.

To my mind it has been one of the greatest misfortunes for religious thought that so many have supposed Spinoza to be a pantheist or an atheist who had nothing to offer to the theist or the Christian; whereas he has indeed much to offer all seekers after religious truth. There is nothing shallow or superficial in Spinoza. As he ponders the nature of man and the Universe, his perspective is vast, and his approach deeply religious. At a time when religious thought is being stirred to new attempts to match its language to its subjects and to eschew a theological choreography that at many points tells more of the antics of man than the saving grace of God, we may benefit from time spent in the company of one who tried to match his thought to a high devotion. We may in the end find his system inadequate, but a study of Spinoza will always keep us from shallow futilities about God and man. Hume may well have been right in his view that there is a logical similarity between the arguments of Spinoza and traditional arguments for the soul. But Professor Hallett would say that Hume was certainly wrong in failing to give Spinoza an activist interpretation. It follows then that this activist interpretation of Spinoza might help to stimulate fresh thinking about traditional arguments concerning the soul. In this way, Professor Hallett's book has a usefulness beyond any of its immediate themes. Like Spinoza, it can stimulate us to more adequate Christian thinking.

Professor Hallett, as we would expect, has given us a learned and scholarly book—written with an inspired devotion and crowning a life's study of Spinoza. As he himself would recognize, his book is far from easy, but it was Spinoza himself who recognized that difficulty belongs inescapably to "all excellent things".

I. T. RAMSEY

TRAINING IN WORSHIP

WORSHIP AND THE MODERN CHILD. By JOHN G. WILLIAMS. National Society and S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

THE AUTHOR of this valuable book on the training of a child in the art of worship is exceptionally qualified to guide others along this difficult path. From a long and varied experience as a priest in parochial work, on the staffs of the B.B.C., of the National Society, and of the Church of England Schools Council, he brings to the task a wealth of practical knowledge coupled with a prophetic sense of ultimate values.

His book puts first things first and theory rightly takes precedence of practice. Hence, the first fifty-seven pages are devoted to preparation through the examination of the theology which must form the basis upon which all Christian worship must be founded. In this way, the author presents us with a picture which depends upon a sense of composition, in which broad principles are distinctly outlined in an integrated pattern, with a judicious selection of detail needed to clarify the chosen theme. The work stresses the importance of the partnership which ought always to exist between parent, priest, and teacher.

In the opening chapters, the author examines the essential nature of worship. This is a necessary precaution to-day when many compilers of prayer-books for children are apt to substitute a species of Nature-Worship for true Christian worship. Attention is drawn, also, to the importance of preserving a proper sense of awe and mystery, which naturally and rightly surrounds a sensitive soul when it becomes aware, even in an elementary manner, of the existence of God. The writer places the worship of the one undivided Catholic Church in its proper setting as the apex of all revealed religion. He summarizes the Christian belief under the terms Atonement, Priest, Sacrifice, Church, and Sacraments. In dealing with the subject of "Prayer", acknowledgement is paid to a variety of masters in this activity, particularly to Bede Frost and to St François de Sales, and attention is very rightly drawn to the danger of impeding the proper development of the soul of a child by the imposition of limits governed by considerations of the child's supposed "understanding".

When Mr Williams passes from the theoretical to the practical aspects of his task, he gives ample proof that he thoroughly understands not only the minds of the children which are his main concern but also the limitations of many adults when they are brought into contact with children engaged in worship. He points out how important the emotions are and how they can be guided and controlled. In the training of children in prayer, he has an important paragraph on ante-natal care and infant welfare. All persons engaged in work with children know how devastating children's questions can be, and the chapter devoted to this subject is very well framed and should be of great benefit to many who need guidance in this matter. Children and Church Worship is the theme of Chapters 7—10. This section opens with an examination of the present position concerning the administration of Holy Baptism, and a plea is made for *some* kind of reform to satisfy current needs. The reality of any young child's education is largely determined by his personal experience, so that anything which is to him an extension of family life may quite early lead him to a knowledge which is both intimate and profound. In this way, the use of the Parish Communion as the Family Service, the paying of informal visits to the Church building, simply for the purpose of becoming familiar with it as a personal "possession", before the child comes to the stage of being able to worship there, the warnings against the establishment of artificial Children's Corners, are all underlined as matters which call for our

most serious consideration. Worship outside of the actual Church, in the Day School or in the Club, is carefully examined, and many helpful suggestions, which are obviously the outcome of long experience and of pastoral ministrations, are offered for the reader's guidance. The recommendation, for example, of an extended use of a period of silence in children's prayers is not the least valuable of these precepts.

This is a book which a teacher can not only read with profit but one to which he can return, time after time, to remind himself of the underlying principles and of the many factors which go to form the art of worship. There may be little that is new in this, but it is old treasure, handled with loving care, reburnished and displayed anew for the glory of God who bestowed the capacity for worship on man for their mutual delight. Teachers, priests, and, I hope, many parents should feel grateful to the author for his labour and for his sympathetic understanding of the basic needs of children in worship.

F. A. POULDEN

CHURCH UNITY

THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE COMING GREAT CHURCH. By JOHN KNOX.
Epworth Press. 12s. 6d.

I HAVE reached an age when I can fairly claim the privilege of impatience at the slow movement of the quest for unity in the Church. Ever since I first saw Anglicans and Free Churchmen stand together at Swanwick under the great streamer of the Student Christian Movement, *Ut Omnes Unum Sint*, it has seemed to me that all outstanding problems could be solved by a small committee of men of good will and learning in a matter of days. And I am bound to add as an Anglican that the hesitations, argumentations, and the prevarications which have acted as a sort of smoke-screen in Conferences on Faith and Order, have come mainly from the Anglican side. I only wish that those would-be Catholics who find every step towards Church unity suspect and difficult would speak in our Councils with the same reasonableness, learning, historical sense of proportion, and charity as are shown by Dr Knox in this most valuable contribution to the debate.

For this is really an important book, important because Dr Knox is thoroughly competent in modern New Testament scholarship, and important because, as a professor in Union Theological Seminary, he puts his case, a case in its essentials truly Catholic, from the other side of the hedge. I may fairly add that I think it important because in all that matters I agree with it heartily, which is more than I can say of the last article I read written from the so-called Catholic point of view.

The point which Dr Knox makes, as I think unanswerably, is that in matters of Church Order the appeal to the primitive Church is not

primarily an appeal to the first century but to the second century and the third. The first days of the Church are determinative in two ways, in their nearness to what Dr Knox calls the "event", the total happening in history which was both Jesus and Christ, and in their vitality, new, creative, and challenging, which was none other than the "Spirit which was in Christ Jesus" and, equally, the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit. Those two characteristics have been renewed throughout history, wherever the Church is true to itself. The memory of Jesus Christ rests not only upon the reading of the ancient records, but upon a vital Presence of Christ in his Church and a vital response in its members, not least in that which they "do in remembrance of me".

But this vitality of the primitive Church did not free it from divisions, to which both the Pauline letters and Acts bear abundant witness. The familiar appeal to the New Testament, which is so often made as though in that way we can reach behind Church history to the inspired and decisive witness of the first days, is in fact an appeal to the councils of bishops which selected and fixed the Canon of Scripture beyond appeal in the third and fourth centuries. It was in fact, with the drawing up of creeds and the establishment of the historic episcopate, part of the means by which, under the guidance of the Spirit, the Churches sought to secure the unity implicit in the "Christ-event" and in the gift of the Spirit. The growing necessity for such action can already be seen in the great Pauline letters, and their collection, for all the Churches, which certainly antedates Marcion, is, like the supervisory appointment of Timothy and Titus, a preliminary step in the policy which established the Canon, the Creeds and the practical and historical Episcopate as the means to the unity which the Church has never succeeded in maintaining or even temporarily achieving.

The strength of the case which Dr Knox offers for the maintenance in our discussions of this threefold and ancient attack upon the "open sore" of disunion does not rest upon any particular detail of his survey of the New Testament. We can recognize that the Epistle to the Ephesians is a major document in the quest for unity in the Churches without being sure either of its authorship or of Dr Goodspeed's recent hypothesis that it was written as a preface to the collected Pauline corpus. There is, I think, quite as good a case for thinking that Romans, in the form which lacks either specific address or personal greetings, could have served the same purpose with its more theological appeal to the primitive essentials of the faith.

Dr Knox is not, of course, putting the case for the historical episcopate in any of the pseudo-sacramental senses which have so often be-devilled the issue. Nor is he over-optimistic as to the speed with which agreement will come. At least he has done all that one man may to speed it.

L. W. GRENSTED

CHURCH MUSIC

HANDEL'S MESSIAH: ORIGINS, COMPOSITION, SOURCES. By JENS PETER LARSEN. A. & C. Black. 40s.

JENS PETER LARSEN is Professor of Musicology in the University of Copenhagen, and his book is the result of careful and prolonged research; but not until Chapter Two do we reach his study of Handel's *Messiah*. Here he gives a minute account of each movement and points out that apart from the strong attraction of these movements there is a remarkable unity of conception which holds the work together from beginning to end. The movements are dissected in a manner mainly interesting to scholars and lecturers, and his findings will appeal to them rather than to the average *Messiah* enthusiast. Indeed the book under consideration is more of an encyclopedia and as such should for many years remain the standard work on the *Messiah*.

Chapter One deals with the development of Handelian oratorio and the author traces the emergence of oratorio from opera. An odd point is that early oratorios were opera without scenery, partly because it was cheaper to produce and also because further saving could be made by dispensing with the famous singers without whom no opera was likely to be a financial success. Professor Larsen in his preface says: "I have tried to prove that Handelian opera is not simply a stage in the general development of oratorio but to a great extent a unique art-form, founded on a far wider base, and strongly marked by Handel's personal experiences and trends."

Chapter Three discusses changing versions. After reading this chapter it is easy to understand why there is so much controversy about the performance of the *Messiah*. The chances are that whatever is done will be partly right and partly wrong, for Handel repeatedly changed what he had previously written. Some of the arias and choruses exist in three or four different versions, each used by Handel himself. This he did to enable him to make the best use of the available material at each performance. There are other reasons too. The *Messiah* is said to have been composed in less than a month, so it is reasonable to suppose that Handel thought he could improve upon it when he had more time, having heard the work at performance. Some of the corrections he introduced, either immediately or later, must be regarded as his own second thoughts, a genuine new artistic construction of the number concerned, replacing the original form.

In this book too there is a list of Handel Manuscripts and the sources. There is a bibliography, an index of Handel's works, and every possible help to the study of his compositions. The general reader may find the book too factual, but it can be whole-heartedly recommended to the student and specialist.

HARRY GABB

MISSA QUARTA: KYRIE ELEISON, SANCTUS, BENEDICTUS QUI VENIT, AGNUS DEI. PALESTRINA. Ed. BERNARD ROSE. Oxford University Press. 1s. 6d. and

MISSA QUARTA: CREED AND GLORIA. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

THIS Mass is adapted to the text of the service of Holy Communion as it appears in the Book of Common Prayer. Its thematic basis is the fifteenth century chanson *L'homme armé*, upon which many composers from Dufay to Carissimi based their masses. In this edition the note-values have been reduced and the work has been transposed to a key more convenient in pitch. It will be noticed that the complete work is divided into two publications, and this will mean a considerable saving for those who do not customarily sing the whole Mass to a setting.

The editor has clearly taken great trouble with this edition. He has added expression marks without which no practical choir edition can be successful. It is sometimes argued by purists that if the composer did not write in the required dynamics they should be left out. In performance this leads to dullness. Bernard Rose has added the minimum which should prove helpful. He has also suggested certain accidentals which were probably sung automatically in Palestrina's day. The music is not unduly difficult, but of course great skill is necessary to bring ease and real beauty to a performance of music of this period.

HARRY GABB

COMMUNION SERVICE IN A FLAT. TUSKIN BAKER. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

THIS setting includes the Ninefold Kyrie and Kyrie plus all the usual sections. It is written for S.A.T.B. and has an independent organ accompaniment. There is some dividing of the parts, and the work should be attempted by choirs possessing skill and a good sense of tonality. The organ part calls for a fair degree of skilful handling. The whole work is imaginative and well-written and should prove a pleasing addition to the library of fine choirs.

MAGNIFICAT AND NUNC DIMITTIS. BERNARD ROSE. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

HERE is an attractive setting for trebles and organ written for the Choristers of Magdalen College, Oxford. The words are happily set in their natural rhythm, yet as the organ part does not help the voices one can only say that none but experienced musicians should attempt this work. For choirs adequate to its demands this setting should provide both excitement and a fine sense of atmosphere.

HARRY GABB

WESLEYAN HYMNS

FIFTY HYMNS BY CHARLES WESLEY. Selected by J. ALAN KAY. Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.

THE publication of "fifty hymns", by however renowned an author, could scarcely fail to attract attention for its mere audacity. At first glance, J. Alan Kay's preface does nothing to reassure the critic. He begins by deploring the "extraordinary difficulty" of selecting fifty hymns from among Wesley's seven thousand, proceeds to explain that he has made no attempt to restore either original words or tunes where these have been altered, and finally expresses the hope that his book may "enrich both the corporate worship of the church and the individual prayers of its members".

In fact, a strange confusion of motives surrounds this little collection. From Mr Kay's preface it is clear that he intends it for practical and even public use; why else, for example, should he make a point of printing always the text of the Methodist hymn-book of 1933 at the expense of Wesley's own? Yet the restricted content, the price, and the luxurious form of the book are all incompatible with its adoption by ordinary churches, and it is scarcely credible that the faithful should carry their copies to church, week by week, in the pious hope that one day it might be of good service.

On the other hand, the note on the cover plainly describes this as "a small commemorative volume", its purpose in this sense being to mark the 250th anniversary of Charles Wesley's birth. From this point of view Mr Kay's time has certainly been well spent. In the first place, cover and dust-cover alike are extremely attractive. The collection of hymns is preceded by a short and lively sketch of Wesley's life by Dr Benson Perkins. A "period touch"—and more, as we shall see—is provided by John Wesley's directions for congregational singing, by the preface to his hymnal of 1780, and by the table of contents of that book. Finally, many of the hymns themselves are printed under their original and very personal headings: "For the anniversary of one's conversion"; "After preaching to the Newcastle colliers". But the presentation of the hymns and their tunes, considered as an act of commemoration, is disappointing; for although they are set out in traditional order, they are also indifferently printed on rough paper, the text is avowedly modern and corrupt, and it is sad to find that only nine of the present tunes were published under Methodist auspices during Wesley's lifetime.

The real value of Mr Kay's book, however, lies not in the reprinting or even the selection of the hymns themselves, but in the rubrics and remarks of John Wesley, which we are lucky enough to have here in full. The table of contents of the 1780 book deserves the special attention of Anglicans on account of the entirely subjective manner in which it is planned. Hymns were chosen, not to mark festivals, hours, and seasons, but to elaborate on individual activities, aspirations, and conditions of soul. "Convinced of backsliding", "Groaning for full redemption", are the Wesleyan equivalents of "Penitence" and "For

Missions". The Preface of 1780 is precious for its definition of the essentials of hymnography, and perhaps for its Christian treatment of "Many Gentlemen" ignorant of the principle of copyright. The "Directions for Singing" are amusing and peculiarly relevant; many an organist to-day may draw fresh courage and inspiration from injunctions such as this: "Sing the tunes exactly as they are printed here . . . if you have learnt to sing them otherwise, unlearn it as soon as you can." Even if they never sing from it, I hope that churchmen and church musicians, as well as devotees of Wesleyan hymnography, will find this curious book both stimulating and entertaining.

CECIL COCHRANE

MUSICAL EXPERIMENT

ILLUMINA NOS. By DON CARLO GESUALDO. Boosey and Hawkes. 7s. 6d.

The work is taken from *Sacrae Cantiones* (1603), for six and seven voices. The missing sextus and bassus parts have been added by Igor Strawinsky.

THERE is an entirely admirable preface written by Robert Craft which does full justice to the background of the work, and to the somewhat Macbethian character of its astonishing composer. It would surely be difficult, in these days, to envisage a situation in which the Church would accept as a penance the building of a Convent in expiation of a series of monstrous murders by an eccentric composer. Such was Gesualdo.

Perhaps it may seem very presumptuous to raise the eyebrow at the manner in which Strawinsky has composed the missing sextus and bassus parts. Our astonishment at the fascinating technique displayed by Gesualdo in both secular and sacred music can in no way deflect from our sense of astonishment, mingled with alarm, at the final result of this Gesualdo-Strawinsky experiment.

There can surely be little doubt that this musical form of wedlock has resulted in far more complex matrimonial problems than even the older of the contracting parties ever bargained for.

On reading the score and comparing the setting of words to melody adopted by Gesualdo, one is struck at once by the different ideas in the mind of Strawinsky. Whatever argument may be advanced for defending this type of "musical degree exercise", there surely can be no defence for much that is clearly clumsy. Strawinsky's bassus part opens the work with a most unsatisfactory muddle of the word "miseri-cordiarum". As the original cantus part, of which Strawinsky has made imitative use, is completely satisfactory in its presentation of musical phrase and word, why should such inept handling of phrase and word occur in Strawinsky's bassus part in bars three and four? This is but one

instance of several similar distressing effects. Surely a repetition of the minim B natural in the bassus part of bar two would have produced a far more satisfactory phrase? Similar criticism could be levelled against the sextus part at the top of page two.

If Strawinsky's aim was to compose the parts hitherto missing, he has certainly fulfilled this aim, and equally successfully avoided the danger of anybody imagining that Gesualdo, albeit eccentric, could have conceived such a masterpiece of harmonic and polyphonic cacophony.

As a piece of sheer entertainment, however, this work could prove a huge success; but it needs a body of intelligent singers, an unbigoted conductor, and some rarefied people of musical distinction as an audience.

CECIL COCHRANE

EDUCATION

SCIENCE AND EXISTENCE. By ALAN RICHARDSON. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL EDUCATION. By EDWIN BARKER. TECHNICAL EDUCATION. By H. D. WARREN. PURPOSE IN TEACHER TRAINING. By MONICA WINGATE. S.C.M. 2s. 6d. each.

THE deliberations of a Working Party convened by the Education Department of the British Council of Churches have led to the issue by the Student Christian Movement Press of the first four booklets of this series entitled "Technics and Purpose". They "examine the issues arising in the growing importance of scientific techniques in our society, and the rapid expansion of technological and other education, and seek to appraise the purposes and values involved, in the light of the Christian faith".

The first essay, by Professor Richardson, is a clever and profound exposition based on the statement that there are two kinds of knowledge namely "scientific knowledge" and "existential" knowledge. From this statement, admittedly for "purposes of convenience only" he develops his thesis by a series of antitheses until he equates religious and existential knowledge. This kind of knowledge is personal and comes through commitment. This involves faith, decisions, obedience, and worship. Hence because Christian truth is most personal it is also the most truly universal.

This conclusion is reached almost by a dichotomy of knowledge and also by a divorce of scientific knowledge from the scientist himself. The booklet, however, should not be read first even though it is the first of the series.

Anyone trying to cope with the problems presented to us in the present "scientific age" with all the complications produced by applied science and technics will be well advised to read the second booklet

first. Rightly rejecting the modern assumptions about scientists, the writer aims at stimulating thought amongst those who are responsible for teaching in colleges. His thesis is that what is first needed for a scientist is a "better scientific education and a deeper understanding of the history, nature and meaning of science itself". No addition of courses in biblical or doctrinal subjects, or in literature, philosophy, the arts, or history will of themselves convert the scientist who examines and handles not mere objective data but a relationship between himself and the data. This involves faith which, so long as it opens up fruitful fields of inquiry and thought and produces beneficial results, is justified. This is not yet apparent in most technical colleges but will come as new generations of teachers and lecturers appear.

The third and fourth booklets set out all the data regarding technical education and teacher training colleges respectively. Both the writers are fully aware of the errors dealt with in the first two booklets and plead for true purpose and wholeness in both forms of education.

In short it may be said that these booklets present a plea that the processes and bases of any form of knowledge and culture first be properly understood and that the true purpose of life be evaluated. This applies especially to all those who lead in passing on knowledge whether in college or school. Misunderstandings about both science and religion must be removed since "it is not an accident that modern science took rise in a society in which Christian religious presuppositions were made". Science rests upon an act of faith and should be seen as part of a larger faith. That is why the Christian faith includes and stimulates rational study.

L. B. TIRRELL

CHURCH PLATE

ENGLISH CHURCH PLATE 597-1830. By CHARLES OMAN. O.U.P. 126s.

THIS is a big book in every sense. Its price will put it beyond the possession of many readers, but plainly it is a book which should be in every serious library intending to deal with this subject. It is indeed the first book to be devoted entirely to the plate of the churches of England and Wales, and it considers this plate both from the artistic and from the historical points of view.

The span of years is divided into two, before and after 1548. The consideration of each period begins with an account of the relationship between the Church and the Goldsmiths, and then goes on to estimate the extent and character of the plate that would have been in the possession of the different types of churches at different times. Cathedrals, larger parish churches, rural churches, and private chapels are all surveyed. Then a consideration of security, the methods of keeping and protecting the plate and the amount of thieving and

spoliation which took place; and finally, for each of the two periods, a detailed consideration of a large number of individual pieces of plate. Particular attention is paid to the effects of the administrative action which, between 1530 and 1580, resulted in the destruction or alteration of nearly all the plate in English churches. Two shorter sections of the book deal, the first with the influence on church plate of the King, both as donor and as spoiler, and the second with the plate kept by and made for the Recusants after 1558.

The author has set himself various limitations in his subject. First, he has concerned himself with the plate of the old ecclesiastical provinces of Canterbury and York, and has adhered rigidly to the definition of plate as meaning articles made of gold and silver. Secondly, he has confined himself to plate used in the service of religion to the exclusion of pieces which are really badges of office, such as pastoral staves and vergers' wands. He has also excluded pieces which, although used for religious purpose, were originally made for a secular one. Thirdly, he has confined himself solely to pieces of English manufacture, though he has included medieval church plate which has found its way abroad. The last and most important limitation is that expressed in the title of the book, the closing of the study at the year 1830. One can well believe that a consideration of Victorian and later plate would have involved an enormous increase in labour and in the size of the study, upsetting the balance of the book. Though, as the author explains, this curtailment "is done without disparagement, since the present needs of churches may well be best satisfied by modern goldsmiths". It would be valuable if the author could one day give us a short monograph on the best church plate that is being produced to-day, and help us to a finer discrimination.

There are: a bibliography, both of general works and local inventories; appendixes giving lists of medieval chalices and patens, Edwardian communion cups, and Anglican seventeenth-century Gothic chalices; full indexes; and two hundred fascinating illustrative plates.

It would be a pity if this book, while obviously a joy to the expert and the specialist, were to be overlooked by the more general reader. Any churchwarden of an ancient parish who takes his office seriously, as well as incumbents, archdeacons, and deans, should certainly at least get this book from a library and browse through it. It might be a good thing to begin by reading the short concluding chapter. "In contrast to the plate which suffers from injudicious use is the vast quantity, mainly Anglican, which is lodged permanently in banks. It is a great pity that more incumbents do not make a point of getting out their plate and placing it on the altar at the great festivals. It is not necessary that it should be used. Good seventeenth- and eighteenth-century plate is fully as appropriate and more decorative than cheap brass flower-vases. It is good for the *amour propre* of a parish to be aware that its church is the possessor of beautiful things given by past parishioners."

After referring to the loan collection which the Victoria and Albert Museum has arranged to illustrate the development of English church

plate through the ages, the author goes on with these suggestions. "It would seem well worth considering whether it might not be possible, by the foundation of diocesan museums such as exist in many continental countries, to bring into the light of day much of the plate which at present remains unused and unseen. Many of our ancient cathedrals could find space for one without great difficulty, whilst some must still have their medieval treasures which could be brought up to date with regard to security without much trouble. Not only would such museums be likely to attract visitors but it might be possible to introduce the students of the theological colleges to the interest of church plate, so that they might more readily understand their responsibilities when, at a later stage, they find important pieces entrusted to their charge."

WALTER HUSSEY

FREE CHURCH LITURGY

PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE FREE CHURCHES. By RAYMOND ABBA. Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.

THIS book is based on a course of lectures given at Sydney University. The author is a Congregational Minister, and writes throughout from the standpoint of a Free Churchman. He does not set out to provide a comprehensive survey but rather "an introduction to the subject and a practical guide for the minister in the conduct of worship". It may be said without qualification that he succeeds admirably in his defined and limited purpose.

The first chapter lays down "Basic Principles". Christian worship depends upon the revelation of God in Jesus Christ; it springs from the prompting of the Holy Spirit; it is essentially a corporate activity; and it is the preparation of the Church for its work and witness in the world. Then follows a compressed account of "Origins and Development". In this historical section, the author is mainly concerned to show that the regular worship of the Apostolic Church was an integration of the Word of God and the Sacrament of the Eucharist. But this synthesis was not maintained. The worship of the Middle Ages was concentrated on the Sacrament, whereas that of the Reformers and their successors was concentrated on the Word. Here the writer handles many controversial matters with a sure and careful touch.

The next four chapters, which form the main body of the book, deal respectively with the Ministry of the Word, Public Prayer, Church Hymns, and the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. All are designed to assist the minister who has no fixed form of service. The main contention is, that the Sunday morning service, as the principal

service of the week, should always be eucharistic in structure. "The ideal is a weekly Eucharist in which Sermon and Sacrament take their proper place; where such is at present impracticable (as in the majority of Free Churches) the eucharistic structure should be preserved." Apart from hymns, the order should be as follows: Prayers of Approach (Adoration, Confession, and Supplication), the reading of Holy Scripture (Old Testament, Epistle, and Gospel), the Offertory, the Intercessions, the Sermon, and finally the Prayers of Thanksgiving and Oblation before the Blessing. When the service culminates in Communion, all that goes before should lead up to that. Where there is no Communion, the service should be in form an Ante-Communion. In accordance with this plan, the reading of scripture should come at an early stage. This is the proclamation of God's Word, and the rest of the service is in some sense the response of the worshipping congregation to the divine utterance.

The author is not in favour of a fixed order of service, but he is certainly not blind to the defects of "free prayer". "Without due thought and careful preparation it tends, all too often, to petrify into stereotyped phrases and *clichés*; so acquiring the defects of a set form without necessarily possessing the scriptural character of the traditional liturgies." Perhaps the treatment of prayer does not distinguish sufficiently between thanksgiving and praise: we thank God for what he has done, but we praise him for what he is in himself. It is made clear that there is a radical difference between the use of hymns in Anglican and Free Church worship. In the former, hymns are extra-liturgical; the liturgy or the office is complete without them (apart from the office hymn). In the latter, hymns are "an integral and indeed vital part of the service itself; they form its permanent liturgical framework." It is recommended that the Bible should be read in the Authorized Version, except where its translation is defective or its text obscure. A note of one or two such passages would have been helpful. For example, the Epistle to Philemon should never be read in the Authorized Version.

Mr Abba finds much to admire in Anglican worship. He suggests that Free Church ministers might well use Morning and Evening Prayer as the basis of their daily devotions. He quotes the Confession and the General Thanksgiving as models, and rightly repudiates any attempt to water down the former by omitting such phrases as "miserable offenders". As an example to be followed, he quotes in full the Prayer of Consecration from the Order of Holy Communion drawn up by the United Church of Canada, and that prayer is based on the Order of 1549. The author's sympathetic understanding of our Church is based on wide and accurate knowledge, but he does make one or two statements to which we might demur. Thus we are accustomed to being told that our Prayer Book is Catholic while our Articles are Lutheran; but it is a surprise to learn that the doctrine of our Church, "as crystallized in the Articles of Religion is Calvinistic to the core" (p. 28). Again, it is not strictly accurate to say that the rubrics in the Prayer Book prescribe "clearly" that the celebrant at the Eucharist should stand behind the Holy Table (p. 176). The principal rubric, which dates from 1552, directs

the celebrant to stand at the north side of the Table. In this connection, we may note that the name of E. C. Ratcliff is mis-spelt three times (pp. 20 and 195).

This book will give very valuable help to Free Church ministers who have the task of providing a form of worship for every Sunday in the year. It might also be consulted with profit by clergy who have to draw up orders of service for special occasions. There is a useful list of "Books for Further Reading", and also an index.

G. J. INGLIS

EIRENICON

FALSE ALTERNATIVES AT THE REFORMATION. By HUMPHREY WHISTLER, C.R. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

TO SAY that a major step towards solving the problem of our unhappy divisions is to make a real effort to see the other person's point of view, is by no means so trite as it may sound. Indeed, Humphrey Whistler, in his booklet, suggests that, for far too long, theologians from both the "Protestant" and the "Roman" sides have been content to pull in their own directions, and to present the ordinary man with the impasse of "either-or".

Thus, to quote the examples of which he makes use, to the sixteenth-century Christian—and to all too many of his successors—one *either* believed in Justification by Works *alone*, or by Faith *alone*; one *either* claimed salvation through the Visible Church, or through the Invisible; and one *either* accepted the dogma of transubstantiation, or one denied the teaching of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

The author's purpose therefore, is to demonstrate how necessary it is that all such false alternatives and misconceptions as these, shall be removed from the minds of people in the twentieth century.

One tends to fight shy of the multitude of little pamphlets showered upon us to-day. Here, however, is something which offers food for thought and prayer, as well as material for endless discussion to any group sufficiently courageous to adopt it as a basis of study.

GORDON HUELIN

THE ARTICLES RECONSIDERED

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES. By KENNETH N. ROSS. Mowbrays. 5s.

THIS book seems to be intended primarily for laypeople, who from time to time hear the Thirty-nine Articles read in Church by a newly-inducted Vicar and who wonder what some of the Articles mean and what their relevance is to conditions to-day. The laypeople envisaged

are primarily those in Anglo-Catholic churches, and particularly such as are well-educated and so familiar with many technical theological terms, both English and Latin, that no explanation of them needs to be given. What Bicknell is for the theological student this book is meant to be for the educated Anglo-Catholic layman.

The author himself indicates that he is trying to give "a general survey of the Articles in not too technical language", and he does also try to relate them to the modern religious situation and show their significance for these days. And just as Newman in Tract 90 tried to show that the Articles were capable of a "Catholic" interpretation, so the author of this book tries to show that they are consistent even with much extreme Anglo-Catholic practice to-day, not always convincingly.

Much of the exposition is most useful, with some very helpful illustrations, but one would have wished for fuller treatment than has been possible within the limits of the book. This would have been most profitable to laypeople in the chapters on the Creeds (with some reference to the materialistic view of our Lord's risen and ascended body in Article IV), on Man and the Fall, and on the Church and the Ministry.

The author is perhaps rather too generous in his interpretation of some of the phrases in Article IX, and too ingenuous in suggesting that it does not rule out the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. The fuller discussion of Salvation, and especially of Justification by Faith, in Chapter V would need rather more explanation of technical terms for most laypeople, and it would have been wise to emphasize (p. 36) that St Paul's phrase, "we were by nature the children of wrath", has no reference to infancy. The chapter on Predestination is most helpful in showing the relevance of Articles XVII and XVIII to the problems and needs of to-day.

In the later chapters on the Sacraments there is much that laypeople will find interesting and useful. Some of the language used about Grace might suggest a sub-personal conception; and it may perhaps also be pointed out that many of us who believe strongly in the Real Presence have grave objections to the practice of Benediction, not only on grounds of authority but also on theological grounds—it is not just a matter of desiring "a less fearful attitude on the part of the English episcopate" or of "the antiquated state of Church law" (p. 74). As to the number of the sacraments, the statement (following Bicknell) that Peter Lombard was "the first to fix on the number seven" needs some qualification.

There is need for such a book as this, and Mr Ross with his gifts of popular exposition is the right kind of author for it. But fuller explanations of some of the Articles would be most valuable and helpful to laypeople, and it is to be hoped that if a new edition of the book is called for, some expansion of parts of it may be possible.

FREDERICK TINDALL

ABRACADABRA ?

SOCIETY, EVOLUTION AND REVELATION: An Original Insight into Man's Place in Creation. By JONATHAN HANAGHAN. Runa Press, Dublin. 21s.

THE "unity of outlook" claimed for the eight essays in this book, described as "an original insight into man's place in creation", appears to be a version of the familiar doctrine of a pre-cosmic Fall, developed and exaggerated to the point of regarding the internecine struggle for survival in the sub-human world as the expression of free and self-determined choice on the part of creatures: as their wilful rejection of "evolution" and "vision" in favour of "devolution" and "fantasy". The "grotesque" bodily structures of beasts of prey are signs and symbols of "dark devolutional secrecies", "plastic mouldings", genetically preserved, "of their egoistic desires". This thesis is carried to fantastic lengths. The lower orders of creation, in the author's view, are "*men* deprived of one function after another"; and orthodox scientists, clinging to their "concept-limited non-approach", are "blind to the man in the atom and in the amoeba, quite unaware that, as they look at the atom and the amoeba, they are being looked at, wistfully, hungrily".

These essays are the fruit, we are informed, of discussions by a number of people assembled by the author, who appears to be a psychoanalyst, in the course of his group-therapy work. The group included, we are told, "Christians, Jews, Moslems, Buddhists, Confucianists, agnostics and atheists". We could have wished for further information about what must surely have been an entertaining *seminar*: such details, for example, as the proportion of Buddhists to Confucianists, and whether the group met in London or in Dublin. Psychiatrists in this country, one imagines, are seldom fortunate enough to have so many representatives of the world's religions among their patients at the same time. In his work with this group Mr Hanaghan "did not hesitate to call to aid whatever wisdom he could, not only from Freud but from the founder of Christianity"; this prepares the reader for the inevitable reference to "that great master of modern psychology, Jesus of Nazareth".

"Much that I have said", remarks the author at one point, "may appear meaningless or absurd." This is unfortunately only too true; for on page after page it is difficult to be certain either of what he is saying, or of what he is saying it about. The present reviewer must not hide his opinion that the intolerable prolixity and pretentiousness of Mr Hanaghan's style do nothing to disguise the woolliness and incoherence of his thought. A sentence or two may be quoted in support of this judgement. "Turn inwards . . . You will gather your strength in the Silences where Utterance is not and where Definition, the shatterer, is unknown. . . . In simplicity in wisdom. Wisdom makes us wise. And when we are wise we pass beyond the limit set by sense: we enter the Un-limit or, rather, the Un-limit enters us. . . . We have spiritual immediacy with the Un-create, which was before worlds were and

before Utterance became speech. At the centre of the Un-create is the Silence. . . . You are the uncreate and the create. You are un-utterance and utterance. You are wise when your utterance is born of unutterance. Literature is born of unutterance. Words not born from unutterance are not literature. Have you not felt what I am striving to say?" (pp. 64-65). We cannot say that we have. But that may be because we have not the foggiest notion what Mr Hanaghan is striving to say. However, the reader who is uplifted and inspired by "literature" of this kind may be assured of getting more than his money's worth when he spends a guinea on this volume.

C. E. HUDSON

PRESBYTERIAN LECTIONARY

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR AND LECTIONARY REFORM. By A. ALLAN MCARTHUR. S.C.M. Press. 25s.

THOSE who have in any way been concerned with lectionary reform in the Church of England will realize how complicated the task of lectionary-making can be. For Dr McArthur, writing as a Scottish Presbyterian, the task is simpler, for there are for him fewer fixed conditions to be complied with.

The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform sets out the principles on which Dr McArthur produced the *Peterhead Lectionary* for the "Muckle Kirk" of that town. The Scottish Reformation has resulted in the widespread ignoring of the liturgical year, with the exception of Sunday; in the abandonment of any form of Divine Office; and in the infrequent holding of services of Holy Communion. The lectionary-maker has therefore a fairly clear field to work in: he is concerned to provide a lectionary for two public services each Sunday (one of which may be a Communion Service), and can construct this on the general basis of the Christian Year, with any modifications which he deems desirable.

Dr McArthur therefore (who has already published a book on *The Evolution of the Christian Year*) begins with the Calendar. He argues that the Christian Year is only half-evolved, and would extend the Advent-to-Pentecost cycle to correspond to the whole content and order of the Apostles' Creed. So he arranges the year to begin with a Festival of Creation at the beginning of October, followed by a six-Sunday Advent, Christmas, Epiphany-tide (as many as nine Sundays), Lent, Easter, and Sundays after Pentecost. Except for Holy Week, he makes no provision for weekdays.

The number of lessons provided for each service varies: it may be as many as five, but three is the commonest number. Both Testaments are always represented, and the last lesson is almost invariably from one of the Gospels or from the Acts. Alternative lessons are frequent,

especially when parallel narratives can be found in the Synoptic Gospels. Not all the books of either Testament are drawn on, nor is the Apocrypha used at all. Each lesson is given a title, and each section is headed by a quotation from the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.

For the Anglican much of the interest of the work lies partly in seeing to what extent Presbyterians are entering into the general liturgical revival; partly in the examination of the Church Year (the "Church Half-Year" as Dr McArthur considers it); partly in the actual provision of Scriptural passages.

The traditional preference for St Matthew, and comparative non-use of St Mark for Gospel lections (to which the Roman Missal and the Book of Common Prayer alike bear witness) is wholly absent from the Peter-head lists. All but 35 verses of St Mark are included, while 686 verses of St Matthew are not. About half of the Acts is used, and the selections from the Epistles cover most of 1 John, half of Ephesians, but less of any of the others.

The principles of continuity (that is of reading selected passages in their proper order), and of special choice for particular occasions are both employed. No selection such as this one is beyond criticism, but the compiler has been notably skilful in choosing appropriate and significant passages, and his work should help in the revival of the liturgical sense in Scotland.

HAROLD RILEY

THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD

THE SUNDAY SERMONS OF THE GREAT FATHERS. Vol. 1. Trans. and ed. by M. F. TOAL. Longmans Green. 16s. 6d.

THE PRAYER BOOK EPISTLES. By KENNETH MACKENZIE. Mowbrays. 10s. 6d.

PARAGRAPHS FOR SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS. By DAVID M. PATON AND JOHN T. MARTIN. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

THERE are many indications nowadays of an increasing interest in, and concern about, the Ministry of the Word in the yearly round of Christian observance. A growing number of people make the Eucharist their principal, or even their only corporate Sunday act of worship. The liturgical sermon takes on therefore an added importance, both as ancillary to the whole act of worship at the Eucharist, and because for many it is the only sermon heard during the week. It is therefore to be welcomed that a variety of books has been appearing, to provide help for the preacher and for the worshipper, particularly in relation to the Sunday course of Epistles and Gospels.

Of the books at present under review, the most substantial is the first volume of *The Sunday Sermons of the Great Fathers*, which covers the

period from the first Sunday in Advent to Quinquagesima. Four volumes are planned, each of which is to be published in a large library edition, and in a handier edition with clear but rather small print. A uniform system is carried out, of printing the Sunday Gospel (from the Roman Missal), together with parallels from other Gospels when they exist, with commentaries taken from the *Catena Aurea* of St Thomas, and with homilies translated at length from several, and often as many as six, of the Fathers. To take an example, for the feast of the Epiphany there are provided, apart from the exposition from the *Catena Aurea*, a sermon of St Ambrose, two of St John Chrysostom, two of St Leo, and one of St Gregory the Great.

As might be expected from the book's Dominican provenance, the author's intention is that the abundant patristic material that he has collected should be used as an aid to preachers. "They can", he says of the homilies in his Preface, "be used either for direct preaching as they stand, or for reading to the faithful, as was the ancient and widespread custom, or they may be used as models for the preacher's personal exposition of the Gospels." They may equally be used for spiritual reading by the faithful themselves. It is unusual to find so complete a collection of patristic writings in a convenient compass, and many will be grateful to the editor for this introduction to the homiletics of the Fathers.

Bishop Mackenzie has turned his attention, not to the Gospels, but to the Epistles, which for many worshippers are much more difficult to be understood. His book, *The Prayer Book Epistles*, is meant to be used in preparation for Sunday worship. For each Sunday he therefore gives some information about the historical background of the Epistle from which the *pericope* is taken, or relates the passage to its wider context in the Epistle as a whole. He does not enter into the more difficult critical questions, and if necessary states an accepted critical conclusion without any false squeamishness. "We must", he says of 1 John 5. 7 for instance, "pay no attention at all to the verse about the 'three that bear witness in heaven', for it is quite certain that it was not written by St John."

There follows in each case an explanation of any difficulties in the text, or some guide to the argument of the author, and a devotional commentary, with straightforward expositions and applications to the ordinary life of Church people. This is an excellent book for the intelligent layman.

A further development of the Ministry of the Word is to be found in *Paragraphs for Sundays and Holy Days*. When Dr Austin Farrer published *The Crown of the Year* he seems to have created a new genre of preaching—a short paragraph to be read to the congregation by the celebrant at said celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, occasions at which it has not been usual to have sermons at all. The authors of the new collection of such paragraphs acknowledge their indebtedness to Dr Farrer, and apply his method, not to the college chapel, but to the parish church.

Brevity is the soul of the method, and it invites a keener criticism than do longer treatments. There is not room in such small compass for verbosity; every word must be necessary, every sentence must be illuminating or evocative. The authors of the present work come well out of this test, and the only question in your reviewer's mind is whether the ordinary congregation can take in the significance of what is necessarily so closely compact. In practice it would also seem that a succession of such books will be needed, if the use of this method is not to degenerate into the annual reading as a modern fixed lesson. It is, however, only by the test of actual experience that the value of the method is likely to be adequately appreciated, and it is good that it should be tried.

HAROLD RILEY

ENGLISH ROMANISM

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN ENGLAND FROM THE REFORMATION TO 1950. By E. I. WATKIN. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

THIS latest addition to the *Home University Library* is an eminently fair-minded history of recent Roman Catholic centuries, and it is to be recommended without qualification to the student desiring an introduction to the period. The author is master of his material, and except towards the end does not falter in his ordering of the facts. He is not afraid to write from a personal point of view, and the result is an account which is both clear and lively.

He does not pull his punches about the state of England at the time of the Reformation: the liturgy was not understood by the majority, and even for the clergy it was largely a matter of ritual observance. "An intelligible but unintelligent reaction against the Protestant reformation has delayed until the present century reforms which could and should have been effected four centuries earlier" (p. 11). Even apart from the Reformation an Erastian Anglicanism would have sprung up in the Church. Elizabeth I is treated fairly. She was "certainly not a religious woman", but "she could show friendship for avowed Catholics". "She insisted on a minimum of ceremonial and a fixed liturgy incorporating much material from the old service-books."

Pius V's bull *Regnans in excelsis* "was a blunder, worse than a blunder, a disaster, probably the most serious blow inflicted on English Catholicism between the Reformation and the present day" (p. 28). Mr Watkin shows how the heroic sanctity and devotion of the missionary priests was robbed of its fruits by the unwise political manoeuvres of the Papacy.

The English spirit of compromise early showed itself in the half-hearted collection of recusancy fines and un-systematic arrest of priests.

Newman was wrong in suggesting that in the penal centuries Catholics were cut off from social contacts with Protestants. This was the more remarkable because it was generally agreed that "the allowed practice of two religions" would ruin the country. During his period of doubt Benet Canfield said, "Whichever religion I believe to be the true one, I will certainly think it my duty to persecute the other" (pp. 56, 57).

The author writes with eloquence and fervour of the life and work of Bishop Challoner, and as fairly as he can of Cardinal Manning. But he is not altogether fair to Newman, whose *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* deserves more attention. On the decree of 1870 he might have quoted Newman, who said, "It was done with an imperiousness and overbearing wilfulness which has been a great scandal", and looked forward to a future qualifying of the dogma by some considerable safeguards (W. Ward, *Life*, ii, p. 380). The revival of Thomism as a result of *Aeterni Patris* has "been marred by the too frequent substitution of authority for reason" (p. 208). He is critical of *Lamentabili* and *Pascendi*: "St Pius X in 1907 could be as mistaken in his policy as St Pius V in 1570" (p. 218).

Those who remember *The Catholic Centre* will not be surprised to find a bias against Italianization. The image of our Lady set up at Walsingham in 1934 "has been replaced by a pious pretty nonentity" (p. 227). He welcomes the liturgical revival and deplores the "unreasonable, indeed sectarian, prejudice against doing what Protestants do" (p. 230). It is surprising that there is no mention of *Apostolicae Curae* or of the Malines conversations.

The book is excellently printed. There are two tiny misprints at the very end (*Wilfred*, p. 210: Cowdrey, p. 242).

KENNETH N. ROSS

EDUCATION IN THE ATOMIC AGE

WHAT KIND OF EDUCATION? By DONALD HUGHES. Epworth Press. 5s.

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE ATOMIC AGE. By C. A. COULSON. Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.

THESE two little books have a good deal in common. Both by implication suggest that we may not be asking the right questions, let alone giving the right answers; and the authors want Christians to ask and to answer. Both are concerned with education in the fullest sense and both are disturbing. Is it true that few are thinking of Man, but rather of this or that group of men? Does education to-day consist in teaching children things which no longer interest their parents? We read that "science is the most important thing in our age" and yet that there is deep distrust of science and scientists ("Don't go near that man, he's a scientist"). Is it true that those "strongholds of privilege", the public

schools, which educate a mere 200,000 of the 6 million children in schools, are quite unsuitable for training leaders of "the unfortunate masses of whom they know nothing"?

Mr Hughes adopts the method of Lowes Dickinson's, *A Modern Symposium*. At the "Dons' and Beaks' Conference" he collects nine men and lets them have their fling. The result is that each view is expressed uncompromisingly, and although a parent sums up from the "consumer's angle", the author contrives to preserve impartiality and we are left to draw our own conclusions. Professor Coulson's short book is the second Scott Lidgett Memorial Lecture. He starts by telling us that population increases by 90,000 every day, and since half the coal ever used has been consumed in the last twenty-five years, and half the oil in the last ten years, the problem of energy is acute. Thus the second Industrial Revolution leading into the Atomic Age is only just in time. He gives some horrifying facts about radiostrontium. "The results of the bombs already exploded will continue with only a reduction to one half during the space of one generation." Strontium causes leukaemia and cancer and "settles preferentially in the bones of young and growing". He says that there has been a good deal of irresponsible talk about the cumulative effect of radiations, and that it is high time to face the facts and form a sober judgement. But perhaps the chief merit of this lecture is that it puts before us the immense possibilities for good which lie before us.

These two books can be read with real profit by anyone and might usefully be read together. They can certainly help us to face questions which Christians ought to be asking and to which Christians must give the answers.

✠ GEORGE WILLESSEN

GOD AS ARTIST

GOD IS AN ARTIST. By ADAM FOX. Geoffrey Bles. 9s. 6d.

FIVE Englishmen are travelling to Milan and, typically enough, do not start talking until their train halts in a tunnel under the Appenines and the lights go out. They are an elderly baronet, his clergyman brother, a stockbroker, an architect, and "the Master"; of what he is the Master no one seems to know, but it is assumed of a College, "not Cambridge, for he had a considerable contempt for mathematics". Someone says that it might be a good idea to go and find out what is the matter. This provokes the question why a proposal to do something is called a good idea. The discussion is general until its course is settled by the remark that "of all good ideas much the most brilliant and original is the idea of God". It is the architect who both suggests and expands the idea that

God is an artist. There is a good deal of discussion "in the dark" before the suggestion is adopted. Since the thoughts of men are to-day concentrated on making the great Machine work, may we not think of God as the great Engineer? No, Craftsman possibly, but not Engineer. Thoughts about how the Machine works "are adolescent thoughts and we must grow out of them". But if God is an artist, are we to think of him as painter, poet, or musician? Architecture is not one of the fine arts because it is never an end in itself. "Music is complicated, because it needs to be performed." Drama will not do because the world is not genuinely dramatic. It is neither tragedy nor comedy, "at best a rehearsal, though actually something of a different kind and much better". Poetry, though the poet is a creator as the word means, speaks in too many tongues. But a picture "addresses itself to the world in a universal language, the language that speaks to the eyes", and "the primacy of pictures among works of art is due to the primacy of sight among the senses". And so it comes to this, that "if God is an artist, and this world his great work of art, he has gone about it like a painter". The theme is developed when the train halts again "in the daylight", and later "under the colonnade" at Milan.

This is a charming little book, and perhaps its chief charm is its tranquillity. As one would expect from the author, who has been school-master, don, and professor of poetry, and who admires Plato and Wordsworth and enjoys pictures, there is a wealth of illustration drawn from writers, poets, painters, and sculptors, and of course much theology. But he does not allow his theme to lead us into thinking of the Artist as remote from his work. An artist expresses himself in a picture and this is often agonizing work. If God expresses himself in creation, we must believe that God agonizes too. Nor can we view his picture in detachment, for if we try to exclude the world we may find that we exclude God himself. Man has been given a share in redeeming the world, and in the very act of redeeming it by his art and his labour he contributes to his own redemption. Health, suffering, death, the restless urge for more possessions, luxuries that become necessities, these and other problems are woven into the discussion and none without illumination.

But the keynote of the discussion and the end to which it moves is contemplation. And who will doubt that if we could cultivate the tranquillity of contemplation we should be all the better for it, and, what is more, better men of action? For contemplation is "an attitude or frame of mind which puts aside the restless wish to be doing something and cultivates a high degree of receptivity out of which there arises at the happy moment sympathy, understanding, light and joy". And yet, although this world calls us to contemplation of itself, "it turns us back again to needful work and action". If this be so, it would seem that the picture must have people and movement in it; for the world we know is not confined to Nature but includes men and women, ourselves among them, who live and think and move. It may be that we shall have to agree with Dr Kitson Clark who says, in *The Kingdom of Free Men*, that "the affairs of mankind must always be conceived as a living drama,

never as a static picture. The actions of men and their thoughts are constantly changing the pattern of life."

The truth, of course, is that when we try to express what God is like, we use human language and human thoughts because we have no other. William Temple (in *Christus Veritas*) warned us that they are all inadequate. "It is true that all analogies fail; they ought to fail. If we had a conception of God which made his mode of being perfectly comprehensible to the finite mind, we should know for that reason alone that it was false." The author of this book would claim no more than that it has helped him to think of God as an artist and that it may help others. He has certainly helped us to remember that from contemplation will come reverence for the Artist who both expresses himself in creation and is active in it.

✠ GEORGE WILLESSEN

PAIN AND PRAYER

VICTORY OVER SUFFERING. By A. GRAHAM IKIN. Arthur James. 12s. 6d.

THIS book is about the relations of faith, prayer, suffering, and healing, written by a believing Christian who has suffered and ministered to the suffering. It is warmly commended by Prebendary J. B. Phillips and the late Bishop of Ely, Dr Wynn, and should interest and help a large number of readers. It is a careful, positive, and moving treatment of subjects on which it is too easy to write either unfeelingly or dishonestly.

Its purpose is both apologetic and devotional, in the sense that it is meant to help "the genuinely perplexed" and to provide "illumination for those who may have gone further along the way of Christian living". To say that the second purpose is better carried out than the first is but to admit that the question with which the book opens, "Why do the innocent suffer?" has no answer except the kind of answer which is acceptable only to those who may be included in the second class of reader.

Among the many useful points which Miss Ikin makes are these: (1) The need for "emotional honesty with ourselves" even if it means being angry with God. She might have quoted many Psalms in support, and have noted that the great thing to be said for such prayers is their implicit faith. They assume that God does exist, but conclude that for the time he must be asleep or deaf. The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. The prayer about which most is said in the Gospels is the prayer of urgent, repeated petition. (2) The importance of forgiveness. To seek forgiveness for one's own sins, and to be free from all bitterness and resentment against others are basic conditions of receiving from God the good which he wills to give, and

form the *sine qua non* of mental health. Miss Ikin barely mentions the confessional, and could have made more of the therapeutic value of regular private confession with the accompanying sacramental assurance of forgiveness and the performance of token penance. (3) The different ways in which the guidance of God can be received. Intelligence, circumstances, human authority, the call to exercise responsibility, desire, prayer, intuition, demands of duty, fellowship in work, reading of the Bible are all possible ways. Many people will not find it any easier to recognize divine guidance after reading this chapter, but at least they will have no excuse for complaining of a scarcity of avenues through which guidance may come, and their eyes will have been opened to the implications of the belief that God works in all the world, not only in specifically "religious" ways. Boldly Miss Ikin gives a set of meditations of her own using "on how to know the will of God." "I was in a deep impasse at the time, through which I could not see how to reconcile two conflicting loyalties . . . I found myself saying 'I will to see the will of God', with no idea of how to 'see' it . . . then suddenly at the cross-roads ahead was the cross of Christ . . . There was no indication of what this would involve: but a very deep gratitude and feeling that I should be guided through from this deeper level until the way of God opened up and the one that could not serve him was blocked and left behind . . ." Similarly she used the words, "I will to hear the will of God", "I will to feel the will of God", "I will to know the will of God", "I will to will the will of God".

It would be impertinent to praise the sincerity and compassion with which Miss Ikin writes. I have only two criticisms to make, and these are but of omissions. The first is the virtual ignoring of the experience of Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians when she speaks (p. 105) of the disappearance of "the communion of saints and the capacity to heal the sick . . . from official Christianity". The first has been vivid and continuous and the second spectacular and recurring over two-thirds of Christendom. The second omission is of any attempt to relate the theme of the book, "Victory over suffering" with "sanctification through suffering". Undoubtedly there has been among some Christians a morbid exaltation of suffering for its own sake. But the tradition of acceptance which has enabled invalids, neurotics, and psychopaths to become saints is too much a part of historical Christianity to be ignored.

REGINALD CANT

OLD SERMON NOTES

MATTHEW HENRY'S SERMON OUTLINES. Selected and edited by SHELDON B. QUINCER. Marshall, Morgan and Scott. 12s. 6d.

BISHOP EDWARD WOODS once prefaced a volume of his collected sermons with the disclaimer: "I had better confess at once that, for my part, I am not very partial to and hardly ever read published

sermons, except those which might be called 'classics'." That goes for most of us. The sermons produced in earlier centuries seem orotund and prolix. We cannot preach them again, any more than we can preach afresh the sermons we wrote as curates. What is to be made then of a series of sermon notes, set out in a modern volume, and obviously intended to be used, compiled by an author who died in 1714?

The answer is that these sermon outlines *could* be used; and that a congregation which listened to them might be greatly profited. They are all basically scriptural; carefully set out in headings and sub-headings; with many cross-references to other passages. There is nothing invertebrate about these discourses, and the modern preacher might learn much from their construction and articulation.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

CRISIS IN THE MINISTRY

AD CLERUM. By HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON. S.P.C.K. 9s. 6d.

IT IS significant, says Dr Ramsey in his introduction, that this is the first of Henson's writings of his episcopate to be re-issued, because those who knew him best cherished most his pastoral wisdom and sympathy; it is also significant because of the crisis in the Ministry which is nothing less than a crisis in the Church. Recent correspondence in *The Times* has underlined the urgent need of the Ministry both as to quality as well as to quantity. *Ad Clerum* must rank as a classic on the Ministry. It should be compulsory reading in Theological Colleges; bishops and priests can read it both for their own personal profit and as a guide to the training of the young men under them; and if it can find a place in schools and the homes of the laity, its uncompromising challenge might help to foster vocations to the Ministry, for there is a growing conviction that we shall not get the best men until we dare to face them with this challenge and call them to heroic response.

"The life of a clergyman is none other than the life of a Christian man, publicly certified to be such, and certified by his own deliberate request." On this text Henson gives us the ideals and the duties, the pitfalls and temptations of the Ministry. Of the former, the most important is "the Christianity of the Christian minister", for he has "not only to proclaim, but to illustrate, the religion of Christ". Humility, discretion, good taste, a high standard of conversation, charity with colleagues, contentment, loyalty to authority—these are some of the essential marks of the true minister. On the other side we have to guard against formalism, greed and arrogance, the fatal severance between preaching and practice, the dangers of popularity, and the "perils of impunity". Henson doubted whether the Christian minister can ever be popular; but he quotes Bishop Butler to show that unpopularity is not

necessarily evidence of faithfulness. There are some delightful touches of the Hensonian pungent humour. "If they (the newspapers) denounce you for your faults, think how much more effectively they could do it if they really knew the entire truth." Curates should not write to their vicars, but go to see them. "Letter writing is a form of cowardice . . . to organise yourself for conflict. . . . Your vanity will certainly lead you to show your compositions to others." Not many will read his discription of the five well-known types of lop-sided clergymen without a twinge of conscience. An occasional remark seems out of date. Vicars may smile ruefully to read that their income is considerably greater than that of most of their parishioners, and curates clad in sports coats and corduroys may laugh at the reference to "Decencie in apparell"; but in neither case can they miss the point which is never out of date.

This is a book to read and re-read, and S.P.C.K. are to be congratulated on giving it to us. May one hope that in time they will give us a cheaper edition?

✠ GEORGE WILLESSEN

OUR CATHEDRALS

THE ENGLISH CATHEDRAL. By G. H. COOK. Phoenix House. 45s.

THIS is a book packed with information about Cathedrals, and one has the impression that the notebooks of a life-time are being emptied upon the page. Sometimes the notes seem to be a little out of date, as when we are shown a tomb pedestal at Ely alleged to be that of St Etheldreda's shrine, though for some years it has been recognized as part of the tomb of Bishop Hotham which stood behind the quire altar in the midst of the quire which he built. But on the whole the information is clear and reliable, and though the book is not likely to fulfil the hope of publisher and author—expressed on the jacket—that it may be "the most authoritative single-volume work available on the greater English churches", it will certainly be a valuable addition to what may be called the *Vade Mecum* class. Not perhaps the book to carry in the hand, but rather the volume to be taken from the shelves on a winter evening, when next year's expeditions are planned before a bright fire.

The opening chapters give a useful outline of cathedral history and constitutional development; for a cathedral, with its dean and chapter, is a constitutional body (as many a new dean has discovered with some surprise) and will only function smoothly if its laws are respected. The Old and the New Foundations are clearly distinguished, and there is some account, not as full as it might be, of the growth and constitution of the secular cathedrals, with their prebendal system, the complexities of "residence", and the swarm of vicars, chantry priests, and choristers who made up their interesting population. The author gives us no glimpse

of the chequered lives of these inferior clergy who did so much to keep cathedral routine going while their pluralist masters were seeking their fortune elsewhere.

Mr Cook's main interest lies in the architecture of the cathedrals, and in four chapters in the middle of his book he describes them all, with much learning and detail, under Rickman's nomenclature of Norman, Early English, Decorated, and Perpendicular, a chapter for each. Presumably the virtue of this arrangement is that the imaginative reader can visualize the architectural development of cathedrals in each period all over England. For instance in the mid-thirteenth century, masons are still at work on Salisbury's west front; the scaffold is coming off Bishop Northwold's presbytery at Ely; just as it is going up upon Bishop Hugh's Angel quire at Lincoln; the statues are being put into the western façade at Wells; St Alban's, Chester, Lichfield, and Hereford are all in splints; so is Worcester where the new quire is half finished; and at York the ambitious project of rebuilding has begun in the south transept. Unfortunately the arrangement has disadvantages of a more practical nature; for when you have read the first (or Norman) instalment of the cathedral of your choice, you have a long and exasperating hunt for its continuation in the next (or Early English) chapter. If only a page reference had been given at the end of each section, the study of a particular church through each stage of its building would have been much simplified.

Along with all this erudition on the architectural side, it is somewhat surprising to find that the author has little sympathy for the religious outlook and beliefs for which our cathedrals were built and planned. Lady Chapels, we learn, were built for "the cult of Mary veneration"; the chantry movement "derived its impulse from the ancient doctrine of praying for the souls of the departed". This sounds like an anthropologist's note on the religious customs of a primitive tribe. He is equally heavy-handed in his account of the "mummery of the boy-bishop". No doubt the ceremony was much abused, but he might have given our forefathers some credit for the beautiful idea which lay behind the irreverence of a rude age, that child-like humility, as our Lord taught us, should inform all his servants, from bishops and abbots downwards—a lesson still to be heeded by all superior persons.

The later chapters in the book include a review of the vicissitudes to which all cathedrals were subjected after the Reformation in the Puritan revolutions of both the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, and some account is given of the nineteenth century "restoration" which adds interest and completeness to the whole picture. A valuable chapter at the end of the work gives an architectural description of the "modern" cathedrals, including Mr Spence's plan for Coventry. There are over a hundred illustrations from photographs, some of them rather elderly, arranged in six groups, and an excellent collection of cathedral ground plans and other diagrams appropriately situated in the text.

In a work so full of detail and factual description it is not surprising to find that the author sometimes nods. But he must have dropped right

off in describing Wells cathedral. He says that while the central tower was rising "work on the Lady Chapel was forging ahead, and the retrochoir with low transeptal chapels was taking shape". This makes nonsense of the history, for the central tower was built between 1300 and 1310, and the Lady Chapel was built as a free-standing octagon about 1326. Bishop Ralph of Shrewsbury in 1345 added three bays to the Presbytery and commissioned William Joy to join it up with the Lady Chapel, who, late in the fourteenth century, devised the beautiful retrochoir to form the link. Another puzzling statement about Wells implies that the Chapter House stair was built at the same time as the undercroft and the passage leading to it. Now the two latter were the work of Bishop Reginald (1180-1198) but he did not live to build the Chapter House which was no doubt intended; and in fact it was not built until Dean Godelee's time about a hundred and twenty years later. So if the stair was really built by Bishop Reginald, it must, for all that time, have led to nothing at all. In fact, of course, it was built for the new Chapter House in the fourteenth century, and extended in the fifteenth to serve the Chain Gate.

But it seems ungrateful to dwell upon small defects in so comprehensive a work which will bring much enlightenment and pleasure to cathedral lovers, even though it may not qualify for authoritative status.

SEIRIOL EVANS

YORK MYSTERY PLAYS

THE YORK CYCLE OF MYSTERY PLAYS. A Complete Version by J. S. PURVIS. S.P.C.K. 25s.

THIS is the edition of the York Mystery Plays which was used at their presentation during the York Festival in 1957. Seven years ago a shorter version was issued containing the text used when the Plays were produced in York for the first time after an interval of more than three and a half centuries. On each occasion the tremendous success of the revival of these medieval Plays was widely commented upon, and the general opinion was that this success was in large measure due to the skill with which Dr Purvis had dealt with the fourteenth-century verse to produce a modern version which contained no crudities but produced a most moving effect upon the audience. Those who were privileged to see the Plays (even on the day when the performance was sadly spoilt by a violent rainstorm) in the grounds of St Mary's Abbey retain a vivid memory of a wonderfully realistic series of episodes taken from the Old and New Testaments.

From the first words of the Tanners' Play, when God proclaims

*Ego sum alpha et O, Vita, Via,
Veritas, Primus et Novissimus*

the interest is sustained while the Old Testament story is unfolded by the Playsterers, the Cardmakers, the Fullers, the Cowpers, and the rest, eleven plays in all. Then, in the twelfth Play, the Spicers speak a series of prophecies relating to Mary and the Child Jesus, this Play serving as a connecting link with the New Testament portion presented in the remaining Plays.

We are touched by Joseph's simple honesty :

Her works me make my cheeks to wet;
I am beguiled; how, know I not.
My young wife is with child full great;
That makes me now sorrow unsought.

We are amused when the Porter abuses Judas :

Say, beetle-browed briber, Why blows thou such boast?
Full false in thy face in faith can I find.
Thou art cumbered in curstness And cares to this coast.
To mar men of might Hast thou marked in thy mind.

We are saddened at the Cross when Jesus says :

Behold my head, my hands, my feet,
And fully feel, ere ending is,
If any mourning may be mete
Or mischief measured unto mine.
My Father, that all wrongs may right,
Forgive these men that do me pine;
For what they work that know they not.
Therefore, Father, I crave,
Let not their sins be sought,
But see their souls to save.

And the first Knight mocks :

Ha, hark! He jangles like a jay.

And the second and third Knights continue :

Methinks he patters like a pie.
He has been doing all this day,
And made great moving of mercy.

Miss Toulmin Smith's edition of these Plays appeared in 1885, and it was essentially a version for the study: Dr Purvis's edition of 1957 is for the stage and even the television screen, and not the least important thing about this admirable book is its exceedingly moderate price.

A. R. B. FULLER

AGAINST COMPLACENCY

"UN-COMFORTABLE WORDS". By JOOST DE BLANK. Longmans. 6s.

THIS book disappointed me. It did not make me uncomfortable enough. Perhaps I should blame the publisher's recommendation on the dust cover. Here, we are told, is a book "disturbing" in its intention; here is a book which is "potential dynamite"; here "is a bishop fulfilling his ancient duty of leadership and encouragement and here the trumpet sounds with no uncertain call."

Those who have heard the author speak, or preach, or who have read his other books, or who have been privileged to enjoy his friendship—and what legions these must number—will have regarded these claims of the publisher as exactly what one would have expected from Joost de Blank. But I think they too will be disappointed.

For in his first chapter the author tells us that he wants us to look again at some of Christ's hard sayings; our object is not to interpret these in order that we may the better understand them, but "to look afresh at some of His familiar sayings that we may be shaken out of our complacency in His service".

To admit that I was not shaken may seem to argue an excess of complacency. But while I found it helpful to think out anew under the author's guidance "Family Loyalties" (Luke 14. 26), "Strange Rewards" (Matthew 20. 9-11, 13-15), "True Greatness" (Matthew 20. 26-8), etc., I did not find that any new light illumined these quiet pages and certainly no explosion was touched off by them.

In two chapters, however, "The cry for unity" (John 17. 20, 21) and "So send I you" (John 20. 21), I felt that the author was in his true form, stimulating and disturbing: and it was good to note that these chapters most clearly bore the marks of ordinary parochial experience so intimately known to most church people who normally make the reading of the Bishop of London's Lent Book an annual Lenten discipline.

But even if you agree with me that the author has not succeeded in his main object of complacency-shaking, you will be glad to join him in these pages, to catch his own humility and to feel the burning sincerity that always makes an encounter with Joost de Blank a glimpse of the Master he so fearlessly serves.

GEORGE REINDORP

PRACTICAL RELIGION

SO EASY TO LOVE. By BRO. ROGER, C.R. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

THE CHARM and special value of this book is its simplicity. The writer keeps throughout to the oft-forgotten truth of God in the soul. God our Creator, without whom no sparrow falls to the ground, tells us that in his sight we humans are of more value than many sparrows. God's Holy Spirit is in us as "Lord and Giver of Life". Christ is the light that lightens

every soul coming into the world. As Dame Julian reminds us, "God is nearer to us than our own soul." However Brother Roger tells us that in this book he is "attempting to express in modern idiom what Madame Guyon meant in her 'Moyen Court'—her autobiography". Madame Guyon was condemned as a Quietist. Quite apart from the controversies of her time, Quietism remains a trap for the unwary, and a very dangerous trap too for the individual and for the Church at large. Perhaps in our neo-pagan days of pantheism and subjectivism Quietism is a graver danger than ever. "God within us" is a truth that ever needs to be balanced by "God in the Highest". The Psalter teaches us the balance: "The Lord is high above all heathen: and his glory above the Heavens" (Ps. 113. 4). "The Lord is high unto all them that call upon him: yea all such as call upon him faithfully" (Ps. 145. 18). How often too do we have the expression, "The Lord most High". High above all the Heavens and yet high the humble contrite heart, is medicine sorely needed to-day.

The reader who holds the need of this balance in mind could not but find much of real help in *So easy to Love*. Short chapters, each composed of brief concise paragraphs, present material in a manner that is well suited to our over-busy rushing age. The truths so presented are also intensely practical. They are living truths gained in the author's own spiritual experience. "God is so easily possessed and enjoyed, because 'in Him we live, and move, and have our being'. He wants to give Himself to us more than we can possibly want to receive Him. It all depends on how you go about it. The right way is easier than breathing. However incapable you think you are of reaching the heights of prayer, you can, if you try, live with God with as little effort and interruption as you live in the world." Who could want a more encouraging and practical start than that?

In the difficult though essential matter of mortification we find the same helpfulness. "There are certain little mortifications that do no harm to anyone—not even to the feeblest in health. Anyone, however delicate, can be careful of what he listens to and looks at."

Is it over-critical to see here and there real dangers to strong spiritual life from his devotion to Madame Guyon? For instance in the constantly recurring problem for many, an apparent incapacity for praying. In the wee chapter on "Method" it is suggested that we should read a book "to get into the mood to approach God". Moods surely hold a soul in a prison house of unreliability. The life of Grace and prayer invites us to freedom from the fetters of "moods". "God sends forth his Spirit into our hearts crying, Abba, Father." There alone is the true and reliable hope for the earthbound soul. Again, in the Chapter on Conversion, the test is given to be an interior sense of certainty resulting in feelings. How many good souls torment themselves for years, quite unwarrantably, because they look for interior feelings in themselves instead of looking up to God and rightly paying no attention whatever to their "feelings".

In the same Chapter, however, we are given a handy and powerful weapon with which to fight temptation. "When there seems a likelihood

of being blinded by passion or desire, the only way to keep control is to hurry back into the Presence of God, Who is always with us, however turbulent the blood, however dry the mouth. That is the only way of putting out the fire, without in any way adding fuel for future conflagrations." There is many a sentence showing the attractiveness of the prayer life. The peace and rounded completeness that comes into the life of one unified in the love of God strike the reader of "He is called a jealous God, which means that He demands a complete fidelity; but when we try to give Him that we find all the lesser loves take their true place with us in Him".

T. L. MANSON, S.S.J.E.

HOLY WEEK

THE GREAT WEEK. By AEMILIANA LOHR. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

ANYONE who wishes to get to the heart of Catholic Christianity cannot do better than immerse himself in the liturgy of Holy Week and especially take part in the climax of the Easter Vigil. The revised Order for Holy Week has rescued it from being the preserve of the archaeologizing liturgist; it is clearly the present Pope's intention that it should become part of the normal experience of the ordinary Catholic.

Dame Aemiliana, a nun of Herstelle, has written a valuable guide for Holy Week, best suited to the person able to join in the whole liturgical sequence. Now that *Tenebrae* is no longer anticipated in the evening, the ordinary worshipper hardly needs to be helped through *Lamentations*. There is a freshness and deep personal devotion in these meditations which will help the careful reader. It is a striking thought that it was not on the ass, but on the foal, that Jesus entered Jerusalem; the latter animal represents the New People of God. The Last Supper was in prospect precisely what the Mass is in retrospect. In giving himself as food, "his suffering and death must be completed in that instant: completed, to be sure, not in a bloody manner as on Good Friday, but completed quite as really and actually, even though under the veil of symbolic action. . . . What happened once, before the historic deed, can also happen throughout the future" in the Mass (p. 86). Some of the language about the Atonement is harsh; "It is the face of his Father full of justice and love together which makes Jesus draw back in terror" (p. 70).

She welcomes the new rites with only a few reservations: the lost knocking on the door on Palm Sunday (p. 31), the eight lost prophecies of the Easter Vigil—why not all of them in the vernacular? —(pp. 164, 205), the new Communion on Good Friday (p. 142). But the gains are immense: the evening Mass of Maundy Thursday (p. 108) is movingly described; the stripping of the altars is not a sign of sorrow,

but only the clearing of a table after the meal (p. 119): "all is joy and thanksgiving".

The reviewer's knowledge of German is scanty, but he would have found this book less laborious to read in the original. For though the thought is rich, the print very adequate, and the dust-cover attractive, everything else is lamentable. The translation is uncouth and would seem to stick too closely to the German original; too many sentences need to be read twice before their meaning becomes plain. There are numerous misprints, and one must suppose either that the translator did not read the proofs or that he knows little of the principles of punctuation. He is also uncertain about *who* and *whom* (pp. 20, 100), as well as conjugations (*thou has*, p. 58; *it remain*, p. 21). It is an oversight when St Theodulph appears also as St Theobald (p. 29), and *principal* stands for *principle* (p. 11); but there is also far too much sheer obscurity. It takes time to parse, "It is the prayer of a sinner who is being justly punished, a repentant facing towards God in vengeance" (p. 125), and there are baffling sentences on pp. 21 and 106. The index could hardly have been compiled more unintelligently or be more useless, and even the table of contents is incomplete. The book deserved better presentation.

KENNETH N. ROSS

GIFFORD LECTURES

FOR FAITH AND FREEDOM. Vol. II. Christian Theology. By L. HODGSON.
Basil Blackwell. 25s.

IN HIS WILL of 1885 Lord Gifford founded his Lectures with the desire that the lecturers "should treat their subject as a strictly natural science, the greatest of all possible sciences, indeed in one sense the only possible science, that of Infinite Being, without reference to or reliance upon supposed special or exceptional or so-called miraculous revelation". In some of the earlier series these wishes have been treated so seriously that almost no mention has been made of the Christian revelation. Readers of Professor Hodgson's second series of lectures will find that he has interpreted Lord Gifford's wishes on very broad lines, and in fact he has given us a thorough and clear outline of the way in which the Christian viewpoint illuminates the whole problem of man in the Universe and has relevance to every human problem and need.

It is true that this volume can be treated as in itself an outline of Christian theology and does not stand or fall as a continuation of the first series. Yet there is no doubt that the two series are closely connected, and readers will profit more by the second if they have first studied the preliminary volume. Dr Hodgson is a philosophical theologian in a great tradition, who does not accept those rigid delimitations of the task of philosophy which such thinkers as Professor Ayer insist upon. For Hodgson the human quest is for knowledge, for objectivity.

One must seek to know truth, and to apprehend reality. Through a careful series of arguments he was led in his earlier volume to hold that through natural theology one could reach a conclusion that "what I call the Christian revelation should not be thought of as a system of divinely communicated truths to be accepted on authority as a complement to what we can learn by our own study of what actually exists and happens. It comes by taking certain events in the history of the world as of unique and supreme significance for our understanding of all things. This involves, indeed, the seeing of all things with the eye of faith. But so do all attempts at making sense of the universe of our experience. For the Christian to try to interpret it with the historic Christ as his key to the understanding is as much a matter of natural theology as for a Marxist to take as his key the interplay of economic forces" (Vol. I, p. 237). The study of God's revelation of himself in general led to the conviction that "the universe springs from and expresses the creative will of God, and that we can find a meaning and purpose for our own lives by thinking of them as given for growth in freedom". This second volume thus begins from the study of God's revelation in particular, in his redemptive activity in Christ, and the whole book should be seen as the working out of Dr Hodgson's thought in this context.

Quoting the saying "Christ gave his life; it is for Christians to discern the doctrine", Dr Hodgson makes another important point which is most relevant to his whole argument. "The history of Christian doctrine is the history of successive thinkers seeking to grasp for themselves that significance (i.e. the meaning and purpose of the universe and of our lives within it) by interpreting the revelation in terms of their age and culture . . . and to answer the question 'What must the truth be if men who thought as they did saw it like that?' " (Vol. I. p. 113).

This second volume is then to be seen as an exposition of Christian theology in the light of the principles derived from the preceding series of lectures. We are offered a comprehensive survey of the great Christian doctrines. Dr Hodgson is a teacher of long experience and his exposition is lucid and thorough. Beginning with the Bible, he shows how Christian theology is "the working out of the implications of certain acts of God to which the Bible bears witness". There is a lecture on belief in God and this is followed by another on God and evil, in which it is shown that "a certain streak of history embodies the unrepeated and unrepeatable acts of God for the rescue of His creation from evil". There are chapters on Christ and on the Holy Spirit, on Grace and on the Christian Church. Two further lectures discuss prayer and providence, and eschatology; and the final lecture takes up the general title of the whole series as freedom and faith.

Dr Hodgson is well aware of an inevitable difficulty in such an exposition as this. For more than forty years he has been teaching and writing on these themes, and more than once he has had to cover ground much of which has been traversed in earlier books. The series may be thought of as the peak of a pyramid the general structure of which is

one whole. Quotations from earlier writings indicate the general continuity of Dr Hodgson's thinking over a period of years. There is much value in this, and we are also given an insight into the heart and mind of the writer through his frequent use of autobiographical material and experiences. Many of his illustrations are quite simple accounts of his own or other people's pastoral experience. These may be unusual in a book on philosophical theology, but they are as a rule apt and helpful. They bring home the truth that in human personality, thought, emotion, and action are all aspects of one whole man, and that a philosophy of life is the philosophy of a whole being.

Parochial clergy will find in these lectures material which is both intellectually stimulating and also valuable for teaching and preaching in their daily work. There are many sayings which have expository possibilities. "Of all men Christians feel the problem of evil most acutely because from the nature of their faith in God they are jealous for his honour". In speaking of prayer he says "It may be that there are ways unknown to us in which without disorganising the natural world or infringing our freedom and responsibility God can achieve his purpose in one way rather than in another and that he waits to let the choice between them wait on our prayers". One would be glad to know that his teaching on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and the nature of life beyond death was well known to the ordinary worshipper.

One must be grateful to Dr Hodgson for a series of lectures which are lucid and face difficulties with honesty. His profound sense of humility before the mystery of existence and the reality of God is revealed throughout. He represents a middle way of thought which takes account of both the Hellenic and the Hebrew strains in our understanding of the Christian revelation. Yet in some ways one wishes that Dr Hodgson had taken account rather more than he has done of some of the problems which beset men to-day. He does not set his exposition in as wide a frame as one would desire. Marxism has raised many questions about the nature of man, history, and freedom, and the questions raised by linguistic philosophy might well have been examined more closely. Comments on existentialism, on psychology, on Barth and Brunner are slighter than one would wish and might well have been given wider expansion. Yet these lectures are in the best tradition of Christian humanism and represent a strain of thought which one hopes will always survive in theology.

MARCUS KNIGHT

GOD AND RECONCILIATION

CHURCH DOGMATICS. By KARL BARTH. Vol II, The Doctrine of God. Pt. 2, 806. pp. Vol. IV, The Doctrine of Reconciliation. Pt. 1, 802 pp. Ed. by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. T. & T. Clark. 55s. and 50s.

IN THESE two massive half volumes the reader will find himself presented with an impressive development of certain main themes

which have gripped Karl Barth with an intensity rarely, if ever, surpassed in reflective experience and theological exposition. The fundamental theme is that the only God with whom Christians are concerned is the God revealed in Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, in whom the holy God was perfectly united with sinful man; the God spoken of in Scripture and witnessed to the world by the Church.

To understand the Being and Activity of this God, Scripture employs the concept of the Covenant, and its corollary Election. God in his absolute Freedom willed not to be God in isolation from man. Voluntarily he elected to exist in relationship. From that primal resolve of God all follows. He created man for fellowship with himself; when man sinned, God, in the person of Jesus Christ, took upon himself the judgment of sin, himself went into the far country of estrangement, and by the Resurrection overcame sin and brought man back to himself in Christ.

In Christ all men are elected; only some accept their election; yet the others cannot cancel it. In some way their election by God remains effective, though they have rejected their calling.

Here, in company with Barth we encounter two mysteries which have always been baffling. Why did God determine (or should we say permit?) that evil should arise? If God wills that all men shall be saved, what is the destiny of the "rejected"? It can hardly be said that Barth solves these mysteries. Probably they are insoluble to finite experience and understanding. But no one can fail to profit immensely from Barth's penetrating discussion. He will have none of the idea of predestination according to which some are saved, some condemned, as by a mechanical and unintelligent necessity. The God whom Barth knows could not act as some theologians have imagined.

Yet there was truth in the ideas of Predestination. Therein it was made clear that all is of God; in everything we are dependent upon him and his grace. By this dependence we are summoned to humility, gratitude, and wondering adoration. Again, we cannot think of God save as invincible. His religious sense of the invincibility of the loving God again and again brings Barth to the brink of declaring that all men will be saved, but his logic holds him back, as well as his sensitiveness to the enormity and seriousness of sin. He will go no farther than to say that no man can put himself outside the purpose, the election, of God: if he will not come into the light, perchance there is yet healing in the shadow.

In the Doctrine of Reconciliation Barth has to show how the true Covenant-relationship of man with God is restored in Jesus Christ. The nature of sin is disclosed only in the light of Man's true relationship with God: therefore in Dogmatics Christology must precede the doctrine of sin. Apart from the revelation in Jesus Christ we could know nothing aright as regards sin.

Reconciliation issues in the gathering of the Church as the community of God by the Holy Spirit. Reconciliation overcomes man's three estrangements, from God, from his fellow men, from himself.

Barth is at his best in dealing with man's estrangement from his fellows as evidenced in the "scandal" of the disunion of the "Churches". One God, one Spirit, involves one Church: a divided Church is tormented by a lie. It would be hard to find a plea for a united Christendom at once more passionate and more compelling in its lucid argument.

I have tried to give a brief outline of this portion of Barth's great work; and to indicate my judgement that it is a book every serious religious reader ought to study. The style is lucid: and the translators have done their work so well that the pages read as if they had been written in English from the start. Barth is sometimes paradoxical in expression; but that has its value; it compels one to think for himself. Sincerity and passion are stamped on every page; and the work is great because it is essentially devotional. The reader lives all the time in the presence of God, and feels the pleading to be true to him. These volumes could help many a preacher to make his evangelism a new thing.

I shall conclude by suggesting one question that Barth always seems to me to leave. Does he unduly narrow the activity of God? This narrowing appears to show itself in two spheres. Barth concentrates on human history. But man is a late arrival in the universe; what has a Doctrine of God to say about the aeons ere man was created? Within human history Barth concentrates on the biblical revelation. But was God not at work in other races than Israel, and in all sincere thinking? Was there no *preparatio evangelica* in the philosophies of Greece and the Orient? Can any part of history be without divine significance, without meaning for God, and enlightenment for men? Perhaps one day Barth will tell us how he conceives of these things.

C. J. BARKER

MODERN PHILOSOPHY

A MODERN INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY. Ed. by PAUL EDWARDS and ARTHUR PAP. Free Press. 48s.

ANYONE who tries to teach philosophy *ab initio* finds himself in a dilemma. If he sends his students to the primary sources they will very probably fail to see the wood for the trees; the idiom is too unfamiliar, the style too diffuse for the beginner to follow the reasoning of these great minds. On the other hand, if he tells them to read contemporary works such as Bertrand Russell's *History of Western Philosophy* or C. E. M. Joad's *Guide to Philosophy*, they will be more than ever at a loss. For modern authors seldom succeed in putting themselves in the position of those who have not even begun to think abstractly; with the result that their books discuss various answers that have been propounded to the problems of philosophy, while the beginner is trying to find out what the problems are, and why they are important.

The present work offers a compromise solution; and at least one reader wishes that he had had it in his hands before he embarked on the philosophy syllabus of "Greats" at Oxford. The method is to combine extracts from the works of leading philosophers, past and present, with a minimum of explanation by the editors, who are careful to state in the most precise and untechnical language, with a wealth of illustrations, what the problems are, as well as to outline some of the solutions which have been suggested.

But the aim would surely have been better achieved if the word "modern" in the title referred only to the method of the introduction, and not also to its subject-matter. A glance at the Table of Contents shows that 31 of the 46 extracts are from authors still living, or only recently dead. And if one counts David Hume and J. S. Mill as modern philosophers the proportion is raised to 38 out of 46. Perhaps it is wrong to criticize the editors for doing what they avowedly set out to do!

Our book may be regarded as a "modern" introduction to philosophy because analytic philosophy is much more fully represented in it than in most introductory texts (p. 5). Students of philosophy are admittedly more interested nowadays in logical analysis and the verifiability principle than in epistemology and the problem of universals. But is it not wiser to give students a thorough grounding in the questions raised by traditional philosophers before introducing them to those who dismiss such questions as meaningless? Would not a reader put the book down with a clearer grasp of what philosophy was all about if there had been four extracts from Plato and one one from A. J. Ayer, instead of the other way about?

This is not to suggest that the editors have loaded their dice in favour of logical positivism. On the contrary, they have been most careful to state both sides in every dispute with the utmost clarity and fairness. They have even included a long discussion between Fr Copleston, S.J., and Professor Ayer, originally broadcast in the Third Programme and now published for the first time. This is very nearly the longest, and certainly the most ill-chosen extract in the book. As well might a liberal democrat argue with a Marxist about the interpretation of history. Their presuppositions are so radically different that they hardly appear to make contact. Fr Copleston, for instance, believes that the Law of Contradiction represents an aspect of absolute reality. Prof. Ayer believes that it is a convenient logical rule for the purposes of communication. There is no ground for agreement here, but equally there is no ground for disagreement either. To disagree with somebody you have to be talking about the same things.

The problems which the editors select for discussion are: the *A Priori*, Induction, Perception, Body and Mind, Freedom, Moral Judgements, God, and Metaphysics. The proportion of space devoted to morals and theology (and to the attack on both) is extremely interesting. One would have expected contemporary philosophers of the analytic school to dismiss them in a few sentences and turn their attention to more worthwhile discussions involving a proliferation of horse-shoes lying on their

sides and sentences about siblings. As it is, if Professors Edwards and Pap faithfully reflect current preoccupations, then modern philosophy is still hag-ridden by the ghosts of these pseudo-sciences. It almost looks as though logical positivism appeals, as Edwards says that monistic materialism appeals (p. 234) "to those who wish to do away with mystery and who fear that once something immaterial is allowed to exist anywhere in the world, the door has been opened to let in such unwelcome guests as the immortal soul or even God."

Perhaps the least satisfactory section in the book is the one which deals with Moral Judgements. No one could expect a comprehensive survey of ethical theory in fifty-six pages. But in effect only one problem is discussed—Are moral judgements objective or do they merely give information about the speaker's state of mind? Here again empiricism and metaphysics declare war on each other and beat the air with their blows. Even the extract from *Principia Ethica*, in which G. E. Moore asserts the indefinability of "good", adds little to our understanding of ethics. And nothing is said of the intrinsically more interesting problems of duty and interest, of ends and means, of virtue and natural law. True, these are not "metamoral" problems; but should not the beginner start with the former, before embarking on the latter?

This section also contains (at the bottom of p. 389) a lamentable printer's error. The words "Let us call the former sentence 'p' and the latter sentence 'q'" have been introduced from a line higher up by homoeoarchomenon, making jibberish of the whole sentence. There is another mistake on p. 396 where Professor Russell makes an optative sentence ("Would that everybody loved the beautiful") correspond to a factual one ("All Chinese are Buddhists".) The mistake is Russell's, not the editors'; but the extract might have been better chosen.

At the end of each section there is an excellent bibliography which lists most of the important works on each subject, marking the more advanced ones with an asterisk, and adds a brief comment on the standpoint adopted in each. Considering the provenance of the book it is remarkable how well English authors are represented. The only significant omissions detected by the present reviewer are Bishop Butler, H. A. Prichard, and R. G. Collingwood. And since they mention the correspondence between Arnold Lunn and C. E. M. Joad, published under the title "Is Christianity True?" (not "Christianity—Is It True?") when Joad was still an agnostic, they ought, in fairness, to have included his "Recovery of Belief".

ROBIN ANSTEY

BULTMANN

REVELATION AND EXISTENCE—A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGY OF RUDOLPH BULTMANN. By H. P. OWEN. University of Wales Press. 15s.

IT IS not surprising that the writings of Rudolph Bultmann have aroused considerable interest both on the Continent and in this country. At a time when theologians are continually being urged to make a new statement of Christian faith in terms acceptable to modern secular society, he offers a challenge to all believers. British readers should welcome a book which gives a lucid exposition of Bultmann's main tenets and also shows the fallacies and dangers inherent in them.

The name of Bultmann is associated with "demythologising" (*Entmythologisierung*). He has stated that a great deal of the New Testament is virtually meaningless to the modern world, because of the way in which its doctrine is expressed. The limitations of first-century knowledge, combined with the heritage of Old Testament Judaism, produced a "myth" which bears no relation to the actual situation of the living individual who is seeking to know and to carry out the Will of God. The act of revelation made by God to man is personal and subjective. If it can be stripped of the accretions of myth, it is found to have four distinguishing characteristics: it is simultaneously transcendent and concealed; it takes the form of a personal encounter; it gives man a new self-understanding; it is not demonstrable, or even supportable, by objective evidence.

Mr Owen examines these criteria in turn. He shows that they each contain a theological truth, but are incomplete and misleading as the basis of belief. He rightly stresses the prime importance of the concept of "encounter" (*Begegnung*), for this is at the root of Bultmann's thoughts and the other criteria are dependent on it. It is the view of Existentialism: that there is validity only in an actual present situation, and that language which does not describe such a situation has no meaning. Bultmann condemns any way of speaking about God which makes the situation "objective" instead of "subjective". Yet he is not radical in his condemnation of traditional language and imagery. "Encounter" itself becomes an image for him; and he is eclectic in approving or discarding the language of the Bible.

The chief fault of this kind of treatment, as Mr Owen clearly shows, is that it over-simplifies. Like Heidegger whom he so much admires, Bultmann sets up continual antitheses; subjective-objective, Jewish-Greek, and so on. He will not acknowledge the truth that "not only is there an element of subjectivity in all historical research, there is also an element of objectivity in any personal encounter" (p. 119). He fails to accept the reconciling paradoxes that are at the heart of Christianity; and this is why much of his teaching can only be described as heretical. In his anxiety to stress what supports his thesis and to ignore what contradicts it, he is guilty of splitting up doctrines which must be held intact. Thus he will make much of the Cross and yet attempt to treat the

Resurrection as a mere symbol (a tendency found among other German Protestant theologians). He discusses the nature of Christ in a way that seems near to Adoptionism. When he writes about the Word of God, he takes the idea of verbal communication through preaching within a particular situation, to the exclusion of all else which that great phrase has meant for Christians. He is even quoted as saying that the Eucharist is "a special mode of preaching". It may be remarked that Mr Owen himself writes of the Eucharist as a "symbolic act"; he may well believe that it is this and something more, but he does not say so.

Yet Bultmann can give the service that the heretic often gives to orthodoxy: a reminder of truths that may be in danger of neglect. It cannot be remembered too often that the Christian does in fact experience continual encounter with his Maker—so long as it is also remembered that Christianity has its corporate as well as its individual obligations, its historical events as well as its timeless truths. Bultmann also deserves praise for attempting to express Christian teaching in the language of Existentialism. Theologians in all ages have used the categories of contemporary secular philosophy for the communication of their faith. It must not be forgotten, however, that the very nature of Existentialism militates against formulating dogmas of universal application.

All this, and more, is discussed in Mr Owen's book. It is a pity that he does little more than glance at the problem which troubles so many people to-day—how to communicate traditional teaching in language that will be widely understood and yet will shed nothing of the purity of faith. He recognizes that "the theologian must not alter either the story or the symbols; his task is to show how they mediate God's existential act" (p. 153). Yet though the symbols of the Gospels may be inviolate, they stand for truths that cry out for new language as well as old. The book has yet to be written which will show how this can be done. There is a debt owed to Bultmann for having at least stated the problem boldly.

This book gives a thorough analysis of Bultmann's ideas, and answers most of the questions which they raise. Mr Owen writes well and clearly, though he has a confusing habit of using the word "we" sometimes to mean "I" and sometimes in an impersonal sense. Bultmann is a thinker who cannot safely be ignored. It is a tribute to his power that he has provoked so many able opponents, among whom Mr Owen deserves an honourable place.

RAYMOND CHAPMAN

JUDGES

COMPOSITION OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES. By C. A. SIMPSON. Blackwell. 42s.

THIS IS a book by a specialist for specialists. Professor Simpson continues in the present volume his analysis of the pre-deuteronic

narrative of the Hexateuch, which he began in *The Early Traditions of Israel* and which he hopes to terminate with a concluding analysis of the Books of Samuel and 1 Kings 1-13. As he says in his Introduction, "this book simply carries the argument of *The Early Traditions of Israel* a step further". The chief merit of the whole work lies undoubtedly in the fact that while literary criticism is generally under a cloud and at present not undertaken by many in comparable detail the author ploughs his furrow without being in the least discouraged by modern trends.

It is in his Introduction that Professor Simpson states his thesis with great clarity and brevity. After tracing the history of the criticism of the J source and the various attempts to detect at least two originally independent narratives he reaches the question at issue, i.e., the relationship of J1 and J2. "Did the evidence point to the one-time existence of two separate, independent documents, or did it suggest that the J2 narrative had been built round that of J1?" The J narrative of the Exodus might be a conflation of two independent narratives (Smend, Eissfeldt's detailed criticism of Simpson's work centres upon the latter's (Meyer). Simpson favours a "pattern of stratification" in the J narrative which is based on a Southern J1 document, which was subjected by J2 to systematic elaboration with the inclusion of Northern (Sinai) material. E's conflation marks a further degree of re-writing before the Deuteronomic process of editing. Simpson stresses the delicacy of a literary criticism in which hypothesis and evidence require constant cross-checking and where "the danger . . . of arguing in a circle is obvious". Eissfeldt's detailed criticism of Simpson's work centres upon the latter's conclusion that J2 elaborated the earlier J1 source: "the question at issue between us—that of the existence or non-existence of a document of the extent and provenance of J1 . . . was one of prime importance". In an Appendix Simpson answers Eissfeldt point by point and proves, incidentally, the delicacy of the methods employed.

But why is the theory of stratification of any importance? In a brilliant summary the author whets the reader's appetite for more, for once again we are presented with the possibility that the Judah tribe (or the southern tribes) and the northern tribes were originally separate and that their traditions reflect different fields of cultural and historical provenance. The northern tribes had no part in the Exodus and only the southern tribes came under Moses's immediate influence.

It cannot be said that it is easy to follow Simpson's actual methods of analysis. As one would expect, he proceeds chapter by chapter; and every verse, after being subjected to critical scrutiny, is assigned to the stratum to which it is alleged to belong. The weakness of this method cannot but be felt strongly, especially by those who have engaged in form-critical enterprises. At the end of this analysis Simpson gives his readers what to some may well be the most valuable part of the whole book, namely notes of a predominantly linguistic nature which are not given in BH³ and not easily found elsewhere. The students of the Hebrew text will do well to mark pp. 93-107 as a mine of information. The rest of the book is concerned with the fruits of the research, and a

translation of the whole book follows: first the J2 narrative, which now incorporates the J1 stratum (printed in italics), secondly the E narrative, thirdly the so-called C (chs. 19-21), and finally the Deuteronomic and later material.

This review may indicate the complexity of the problems which cannot help affecting the format of the book itself. A good policy for the reader who wishes to appreciate the work is to follow up one problem at a time. For example he may well select the Song of Deborah and begin by turning to the translation and then study its justification in the analytical and textual notes.

U. E. SIMON

ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION

THE LETTER AND THE SPIRIT. By R. M. GRANT. S.P.C.K. 15s.

DR GRANT, who is a member of the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, deals with a fascinating subject, namely the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, with special reference to the methods of Origen. He presents an immense amount of learning in an orderly and readable manner, and has given us a book which must be studied by any professional exegete of Scripture, and will be enjoyed by any reader who is interested in the problems of interpreting the Bible.

The author's concern is with the theory that lies behind the development of allegorization in the early Church. Why did the Fathers allegorize? In the first place, because that was the way in which the Greeks interpreted their own poets, and the Alexandrine Jews their Old Testament Scriptures. To this historical background a quarter of the book is devoted. Secondly, because the Old Testament is already treated allegorically in the New. The teaching of Jesus contains mysterious parables which come close to allegory, although Dr Grant does not believe that our Lord himself used all the allegorical interpretations of parable in the Gospels. But first the Jewish Christian of Jerusalem and then Paul employed allegory to bring the Old Testament into agreement with Christian teaching. In the second century Marcion declares that the Old Testament must be rejected because it contradicts the true Gospel of Jesus and Paul. The Church uses more allegory to remove the contradiction. The Gnostics say that they are the people who know what the Gospel means, and the Church stresses the historically prophetic nature of the Old Testament. The Montanists claim that the New Testament, too, is predictive, and that they are the fulfilment. In reply the Church appeals to the open tradition of the apostolic sees, and to the apostolic witness to historic events. "To a considerable extent, the allegorization at Alexandria is a reaction from this concentration on

historic reality, and the authority of past events. There the study of Philo is fused with gnostic and Christian insights to create a new allegorization".

If a criticism of the arrangement of the book be permitted it would be that too great a proportion of the space is devoted to the background introduction, and too little (20 pp. in all) to what the preface suggests is going to be the main subject. Origen represents the high water mark of allegorization in the early Church, and even allegorizes plainly historical passages in the Gospels in order to bring out their "higher meaning". In view of current tendencies, we should have welcomed more on the relation of typology to allegory.

Perhaps the general reader will find the last chapter the most rewarding of all, and will have his own understanding of the Bible deepened by the discussion of the strength and weakness of the allegorizers' methods. Their strength lay in their insistence that God speaks through the writings of prophets and apostles; in their conviction that revelation has a meaning for the present as well as the past, and that inspiration has given to the writers a creative power over their material. Their weakness is that they emptied history of meaning, seeing events as symbols, and persons as parables. "But the basic difficulty . . . lay in their presupposition of the absolute infallibility and authority of ancient documents. . . . The exegete, unwilling to admit that contradictions exist, flees to the refuge provided by a higher spiritual truth." But, asks Dr Grant very fairly, do we do any better? Liberal Protestants thought that they could separate the husk from the kernel and less Liberal Protestants used Pauline doctrine as the standard by which to criticize the rest of the New Testament. Both have had things made difficult for them by the Form critics, and the remark is quoted (without disapproval) that "if you wish to find the Holy Spirit in the Bible you look first in passages marked R (Redactor) by the critics". In his concluding pages Dr Grant points to a possible correlation of the view that stresses the continuity of Christian experience and that which stresses the creative originality of the evangelists with a belief in the original richness of the teaching of the Lord, in terms of the modern Roman Catholic discussion of the *sensus plenior*, which is not very different from Origen's allegorical meaning. Here perhaps is meeting ground for the theologian and the historian. They need each other, but they both need the common context of the Christian community within which to help each other make intelligible the Gospel which the Church proclaims.

The value of this excellent book is increased by its appendixes, especially the second (of 22 pp.) in which the principal technical terms used by allegorizers are discussed, with the primary purpose of supporting the claim that there is a direct line of continuity between Greek and Christian exegesis.

REGINALD CANT

GTU Library



3 2400 00270 6707

The Church quarterly review

v.159
1958

339500

v.159
1958

THREE DAY

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY

BERKELEY, CA 94709

